



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2007

No. 101—Part II

House of Representatives

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RE-
LATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIA-
TIONS ACT, 2008—Continued

□ 1645

And so I say very respectfully, the American people don't want to see their tax dollars used to fund abortion overseas, and the American people don't want to see their taxpayer dollars used to make in-kind contributions to organizations that fund abortion and promote abortion as well.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Chairwoman LOWEY has made it perfectly clear her intent to allow only for the provision of donated contraceptives. Some of our colleagues have expressed concerns that the language, as currently written, could be interpreted more broadly than intended. Therefore, Chairwoman LOWEY is offering this amendment to clarify this provision.

This amendment is crystal clear, my friends. It would only allow nongovernmental organizations to receive U.S. donated contraceptives, not funds, for distribution to millions of men and women in desperate need of these products.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot reduce abortions without contraception. That is a fact. Contraception is about prevention. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to talk about prevention, that is the focus of this amendment.

And let me just say this to all of my colleagues; for those in this body who proclaim to want to protect lives and to save lives and that is your mission, you have but one choice in this debate, and that is to support the Lowey amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have one more speaker in this round.

The gentlelady has the right to close, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia who is in opposition to the amendment has the right to close.

Mr. WOLF. Would the gentlewoman like to proceed, then?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point. We heard the word "fungible" and "fungibility" more than once today. I just want to apply that logic to China because we've heard about China today.

According to the logic of money being fungible, all of the money that our friends on the other side over the past 6 years who have borrowed from China, allowed China to make money on the interest, and therefore use that money to have forced abortions in China, that's fungible.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the other side was as concerned about forced abortions in China when they were busting the budget over the last 6 years.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is reminded that she is not allowed to yield blocks of time. She is allowed to yield time, but not in set amounts.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to have this opportunity to rise in support of the Lowey amendment.

I share Chairwoman LOWEY's concerns about the lack of access to contraceptives, the lifesaving tool for disease prevention in the developing world.

The World Health Organization estimates that 80 million women face unwanted pregnancies each year. More than 150 million couples have no access to family planning, and more than 75,000 women die each year due to complications related to unsafe abortion. These staggering statistics reflect the dire situation in countries such as Ghana, Ethiopia, Romania and many others as nations struggle to provide health care and basic services to their citizens.

It is a tragedy that 24.5 million people are living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa, where more than 12 million children have been orphaned by AIDS. I know that I speak for the vast majority of Americans when I say that we have a responsibility to respond to this crisis.

Like so many of my colleagues, I am opposed to abortion. And this position compels me to work to promote access to contraception and other methods of pregnancy prevention. I also feel that being pro-life means working to protect life at all stages, and to alleviate suffering wherever I am able to do so is an important priority. Rarely has the world known such intense suffering as that faced by sub-Saharan Africa today.

Mr. Chairman, we must do everything in our power to ensure that the money we spend on international family planning, \$441 million in this bill, will be used in the most effective way. The Lowey amendment makes sure that we do that.

I want to thank Chairwoman LOWEY for her leadership.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, this debate has been crystal clear. You know,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6889

at times we've kind of passed over each other, but it isn't about abortion. I also want to thank the gentlelady for putting clauses on abortion in the bill. And it's not about family planning, because this doesn't change the family planning fund.

There is only one debate here, and that is, should family planning money go to organizations that advocate or perform abortion? And that is really what this is about. Those organizations are restricted under the Mexico City Policy. And that is in fact, in the view of people who are against abortion, providing public funds if you provide the condoms or whatever you're giving in in-kind aid.

Now, for example, as a Republican candidate, I'm not likely to get cash funding from anybody on your side of the aisle. But I have a feeling that if somebody donated stamps to me or donated a mailing to me or donated things in my office, your side would view that the same as a cash contribution. And people back home can understand that money this direct is, in fact, fungible. We have had this debate since I've been in Congress on faith-based. Every time the faith-based argument comes up, your side of the aisle argues that giving money to pay for preachers' expenses, for electricity at a Christian organization, is in fact the same as a direct contribution to those faith-based organizations. You can't have it both ways.

In fact, this is fungible money. The debate if you're against abortion is, you do not believe that money should go to organizations, taxpayer money, taken and collected from people who have a passionate opposition to abortion as well as those who favor abortion, should go to organizations that advocate that. If you're for abortion, you believe that should be allowed. And that's clearly what we've established in this debate. It's crystal clear.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this is the article that I referred to, Public Radio, I'll put it in the RECORD. It says, Morning Edition, April 23. "During the past week, dozens of women in southwest China have been forced to have abortions even as late as 9 months into the pregnancy, according to evidence uncovered by NPR." It goes on, mentions a family which Liang describes how they told her that she would have to have an abortion. "You don't have any more room for maneuver," he says they told her. "If you don't go to the hospital, we'll carry you." The couple was then driven to Youjiang district maternity ward in Baise City. "I was scared," Wei told NPR. "The hospital was full of women who had been brought in forcibly. There wasn't a single spare bed. The family planning people said forced abortions or forced sterilization were both being carried out. We saw women being pulled in one by one."

Now, in answer to Mr. RYAN's comment, Mr. RYAN, I led the opposition over here in opposition to PNTR. President Clinton was one of the biggest supporters. He accused President Bush, criticized him, and then switched and strongly supported it.

I have sent your office, with due respect, probably 25 letters asking you as a Blue Dog member to cosponsor a bill that I have, and I'll do it again, on the SAFE Commission. On my SAFE Commission I have eight Members from the Democratic Party, eight Members from the Republican Party, and I put everything on the table, tax policy. Someone on your side said there is no Republican over there that would do it. I put tax policy on it. Some of my people don't like it, but we do. We also put all the entitlements to save the country.

I agree with you. God bless you. I agree that the debt that the Saudis hold is terrible. The debt that the Chinese hold. And I would beg you, because I know you're a good person, I watch you in committee, I followed your campaigns, join me in the SAFE Commission. We can get a handle on this deficit that we have in the country. This places a partisan political pit, and both sides are at each other.

So what I want to do is what we did on the Iraq Study Group, get eight Republicans and eight Democrats, give 1 year, this is modeled after David Walker, the GAO, to go around the country and educate and talk to the American people and listen. And then we use the Base Closing Commission concept whereby this Congress has to vote.

You're right. The amount of debt that the Chinese hold is horrible and that the Saudis hold. And I have written you over and over. The fact is, I will say it right now, I've been surprised that I haven't had anybody from your side cosponsor, because I will stipulate you care about the deficit as much as I do, maybe as a newer Member you may actually care about it more. But I agree with you, and the SAFE Commission is the opportunity to deal with this.

If you look at the language in the package I'll send to your office, I put every single thing on the table. And if you would join me, I don't know if we could pass it in this Congress or not, but I think you're exactly right, we could help save this country because we are living off of Chinese money and Saudi money. And keep in mind, the Saudis funded all the madrasses up at the border. There were 15 Saudis funding the Wahhabis. The Saudis are funding radical, anti-Christian, anti-Semitic. So if we could come together and do that.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I think that clearly the ranking member is one of the extraordinary Members of this Congress, who has

enormous credibility across a wide range of issues. But I think, given that the ranking member's arguments in committee are so substantive and so sound, I want to make it clear, at least for Members, about the context of the debate. And if the chairman would correct me if I'm wrong.

Many of the NGOs that we are talking about are also the same NGOs that provide primary care in many of these villages for which the language is directed. If we provide them with Child Survival funds, are these medicines fungible for the same NGOs? In many of these villages in the Third World, it's not that there are three or four doctors in the village, it's the same doctor. There is a shortage of doctors and nurses. It's the same doctors being sponsored by the same NGOs on the ground in these villages. They're either providing primary care, preventive care, making recommendations to people within the village on how they should behave and/or what are necessary to address their primary care issues.

If we provide them with AIDS treatments, are those same AIDS treatments fungible? And how is it that we can sit here and argue, at least from Washington, a different reality that is taking place on the ground where these issues are taking place? If the chairman would respond. I ask for the committee's indulgence.

Mr. WOLF. The gentleman's concern, and the gentleman is a very good Member, and I appreciate when he speaks a lot of times in committee. I agree with him, and not only do I agree in my conscience, I vote with him, and sometimes I even speak for him. But it is an issue here of going to the groups that are involved, and I will put a copy of the article in the RECORD, but the two that I mention, and to give them the support whereby they would do these things. I can't speak for other people, but I think it would be wrong.

JUNE 21, 2007

CASES OF FORCED ABORTIONS SURFACE IN CHINA

(By Louisa Lim)

MORNING EDITION, APRIL 23, 2007.—During the past week, dozens of women in southwest China have been forced to have abortions even as late as nine months into the pregnancy, according to evidence uncovered by NPR.

China's strict family planning laws permit urban married couples to have only one child each, but in some of the recent cases—in Guangxi Province—women say they were forced to abort what would have been their first child because they were unmarried. The forced abortions are all the more shocking because family planning laws have generally been relaxed in China, with many families having two children.

Liang Yage and his wife Wei Linrong had one child and believed that—like many other couples—they could pay a fine and keep their second baby. Wei was 7 months pregnant when 10 family planning officials visited her at home on April 16.

Liang describes how they told her that she would have to have an abortion: "You don't have any more room for maneuver," he says

they told her. "If you don't go [to the hospital], we'll carry you." The couple was then driven to Youjiang district maternity hospital in Baise city.

"I was scared," Wei told NPR. "The hospital was full of women who'd been brought in forcibly. There wasn't a single spare bed. The family planning people said forced abortions and forced sterilizations were both being carried out. We saw women being pulled in one by one."

The couple was given a consent agreement to sign. When Liang refused, family planning officials signed it for him. He and his wife are devout Christians—he is a pastor—and they don't agree with abortion.

The officials gave Wei three injections in the lower abdomen. Contractions started the next afternoon, and continued for almost 16 hours. Her child was stillborn.

"I asked the doctor if it was a boy or girl," Wei said. "The doctor said it was a boy. My friends who were beside me said the baby's body was completely black. I felt desolate, so I didn't look up to see the baby."

Medical sources say fetuses aborted in this manner would have been dead for some time, so the tissue is necrotic and thus dark in color.

"The nurses dealt with the body like it was rubbish," Wei said. "They wrapped it up in a black plastic bag and threw it in the trash."

This was also the treatment given to the stillborn baby of He Caigan. Family planning officials turned up at her house, in the countryside several hours outside Baise, before dawn on April 17 to force her to go to the hospital. This would have been her first baby—but she hadn't married the father, in contravention of family planning laws. She was already 9 months pregnant, just days away from delivery.

"They told me I'm too young, I couldn't keep the child and I should have an abortion," she said. "I'm too young to get a marriage certificate—I'm only 19 and my boyfriend's only 21."

After the forced abortion, her boyfriend left her. She said that she's still in great physical pain and that her life had been ruined.

An eyewitness, who requested anonymity for fear of the consequences, said that he counted 41 occupied beds on just one floor of the maternity hospital in Baise and that he believed none of the women he saw had come to the hospital of their own free will.

Coerced abortions such as these were not unusual after China's one-child policy was first introduced in 1980. But a law passed five years ago guarantees China's citizens a degree of choice in family matters. When contacted for comment, an official at China's State Commission for Population and Family Planning said she'd heard nothing about forced abortions in Guangxi and asked for more details. But in Baise, a family planning official surnamed Nong acknowledged that such behavior would violate regulations. Despite the fact that these allegations refer to events that happened just within the last week, he said an investigation had already been held.

"We were very surprised to hear of these accusations," Nong said, "but our investigation concluded some individuals who were dissatisfied with our family planning policies were fabricating stories. These facts simply don't exist. We really love and care for women here."

Official figures published by the Xinhua news agency shed some light on why a forced abortion campaign might be judged necessary. They show that the Baise government missed its family planning targets last year. The recorded birth rate was 13.61 percent, slightly higher than the goal of 13.5 percent. This is significant because the ca-

reer prospects of local officials depend upon meeting these goals.

Wei Linrong and her husband Liang Yage, were incensed by their treatment, seeing it as little short of murder.

"I think their methods are too cruel," said Wei, "my heart really hurts. Such a tiny baby, it was innocent. And they killed it."

"Every time we talk about this child, we both cry," Liang added. "We can't bear talking about this child."

Liang and his wife risked further official disapproval by contacting a Christian group overseas to publicize their plight. China may once have depended on its state apparatus of control and fear to silence those who suffer human rights abuses at the hands of its officials. But China's victims are angry, and they want their voices to be heard.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the Lowey Amendment to the State Department and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. This amendment is a poison pill that will result in a veto by the President.

The original Mexico City policy, which was emasculated in the Appropriations Committee, prevents U.S. population assistance funds from going to foreign organizations which "perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning." This was done to ensure compliance with the long-standing law that taxpayer dollars cannot be used to finance abortion, except in the case of rape, incest, or danger to the life of the mother. The Stupak-Smith amendment restores the Mexico City policy to its original intent.

On the other hand Mr. Chairman, the Lowey amendment, masks the effort to fund pro-abortion organizations with U.S. tax dollars. This amendment would provide economic support in the form of valuable commodities and other items to organizations that promote and provide abortion as a method of family planning. Additionally, this amendment does not increase USAID funding for contraceptives, as the amendment's supporters have claimed.

In fact, it does nothing to increase contraception and simply diverts contraceptive commodities from organizations that DO NOT promote or provide abortion to organizations that DO promote or provide abortion as a method of family planning.

This "stealth amendment" further undermines the Mexico City policy that President Reagan established in 1984. Prior to the implementation of the Mexico City policy by President Reagan in 1984, organizations which support abortion such as Planned Parenthood kept two sets of books in order to qualify for U.S. funds: one tracking the use of taxpayer dollars for services such as family planning counseling and contraception distribution, and another chronicling the use of private organization funds for abortion-related expenses. Mr. Chairman, we all know that money is fungible. Such double bookkeeping ensured that taxpayer dollars for family planning inevitably subsidized abortion by freeing up more private funds for this purpose. The Mexico City policy was adopted to stop this practice.

Mr. Chairman, while President Clinton revoked this policy, it was reinstated by President Bush to ensure American citizens are not forced to pay for a procedure many find morally abhorrent.

Additionally Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleagues that the President has threatened to veto any legislation that weakens existing pro-life protections. Oppos-

ing the Lowey amendment and supporting the Stupak-Smith amendment will ensure that the hard work our colleagues have put into this appropriations bill is not for nothing.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Lowey amendment and support the Stupak-Smith Amendment to restore the Mexico City Policy to its original intent.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment and of the underlying bill, which provides overseas family planning providers with a targeted exemption from the restrictions of the Global Gag Rule.

As this amendment makes crystal clear, the contraceptive exemption in this bill allows for only the provision of donated contraceptives—not funding—to NGOs that would otherwise be barred from receiving U.S. assistance. In so doing, this bill will provide millions of men and women with contraceptive products.

Since President Bush reinstated the Global Gag Rule in 2001, U.S. government shipments of contraceptives and condoms have ceased to twenty developing countries, including Cote d'Ivoire and Vietnam—two focus countries of the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

Restricting access to U.S.-donated contraceptives and condoms is counterproductive to our country's unprecedented commitment to the fight against HIV/AIDS.

Furthermore, providing modern contraceptives to the 200 million women in the developing world who desire this health care would avert 52 million unwanted pregnancies, prevent 22 million abortions, and would keep 505,000 children from losing their mothers each year.

Put simply, contraceptives prevent unintended pregnancies which often end in abortion, and condoms prevent the transmission of HIV/AIDS. These facts are undisputable.

I commend Chairwoman LOWEY for her willingness to offer this amendment to clarify the legislative intent of this important provision, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in order to protect access to common-sense prevention measures that will improve the health and well-being of individuals, families, and communities worldwide.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Strike the last proviso of section 622 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman

from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 22½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, someday future generations of Americans will look back on us and wonder how and why such a rich and seemingly enlightened society, so blessed and endowed with the capacity to protect and enhance vulnerable human life, could have instead so aggressively promoted death to children by abortion.

They will note that we prided ourselves on our human rights rhetoric and record, while precluding unusually all protection to the most persecuted minority in the world today, unborn children. They will indeed wonder why it took so long to stop just one hideous method of death, partial-birth abortion—and why dismembering a child with sharp knives, pulverizing a child with powerful suction devices or chemically poisoning a baby with any number of toxic chemicals, failed to elicit so much as a scintilla of empathy, mercy or compassion for the victims.

□ 1700

Abortion is violence against children, Mr. Chairman. It is extreme child abuse. It is cruelty to children. It exploits women. In America, it has destroyed 49 million unborn babies and wounded countless numbers of women.

Now, as in previous years, some Members of Congress want to export the violence of abortion to Africa, Latin America and parts of Asia and Europe by reversing the prolife Mexico City policy and by providing in-kind assistance to some of the most vociferous pro-abortion organizations on the Earth. To counter that, Mr. STUPAK and I are offering an amendment, to strike the pro-abortion enabling language contained in this bill.

First announced by the Reagan administration at a 1984 U.N. Population Conference held in Mexico City, hence its name, the current policy simply requires that foreign nongovernmental organizations agree, as a condition of their receipt of Federal assistance for family-planning activities, to neither perform nor actively promote abortion as a method of family planning.

The three exceptions in the Mexico City policy are rape, incest and life of the mother.

Mr. Chairman, today, scores of countries throughout the world are literally under siege in a well-coordinated, exceedingly well-funded campaign to legalize abortion on demand, putting women and children at risk. Most of the pressure is coming directly from foreign nongovernmental organizations like the International Planned Parenthood Federation based in London. IPPF and its country affiliates perform abortions and lobby aggressively for abortion on demand.

IPPF, you will recall, in 1992 adopted an abortion manifesto called Vision

2000, a sweeping "action plan." Vision 2000 says that IPPF and its affiliates, and I quote this, "Will bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative changes to remove restrictions against abortions." The Mexico City policy puts a stop to enabling IPPF and likeminded groups from doing just that.

So it couldn't be more clear, Mr. Chairman, that if we provide either cash or in-kind contributions to abortion organizations, we empower them and we enable them to campaign to expand abortion. Instead, we should direct our funds and in-kind assistance, including commodities and contraceptives, to organizations committed only to family planning.

IPPF's vision, Mr. Chairman, is what I call a nightmare. Earlier my friend, Mr. JACKSON, was talking about the least of our brethren in found Matthew is Gospel, Chapter 25. Who in this world fits the definition of the least of our brethren more than a helpless unborn child who is being killed by dismemberment or chemical poison? I don't know who. Unborn babies are the most vulnerable people on Earth, I say to my good friend.

IPPF's vision is a world of free abortion and unfettered access to subsidized abortion rights right up until birth. It is all in their documents. They're for abortions for minors even without any parental notification or consent, and they don't like conscience clauses for doctors and health care practitioners, either.

One only has to look at Planned Parenthood here in the United States to understand where their affiliates would take the rest of the world. The Planned Parenthood Federation of America has, for example, colocated family planning clinics with abortion mills. They annually perform 265,000 abortions every year in America, a quarter of all the abortions in our country, a staggering loss of children's lives. One organization. They lobby and litigate to stop women's right-to-know laws and parental consent laws. They lobby in favor of partial birth abortion. If that is not child abuse, I don't know what is. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, that is what they want to do everywhere. We kid ourselves if we don't realize that and appreciate that.

The Mexico City policy, on the other hand, separates abortion from family planning in certain foreign aid programs. It ensures that family planning is the exclusive activity of the organization and not abortion. If we provide other cash or in-kind contributions or anything of value, we again empower, we enrich and we enable these organizations. It is all about whom we give to.

Finally, I would like to say with deep respect to my prolife colleagues, especially on the Democratic side of the aisle, some of whom are under intense pressure to support the other side and to oppose Mr. STUPAK and me, if protecting babies and women from abor-

tion matters to you, and I mean really, really matters to you, there is no way that any of us could work to overturn the Mexico City policy. This is the time to stand for the innocent and the inconvenient ones who can't speak for themselves.

I would remind my colleagues again that nothing in our language today cuts by a penny the money that is allocated in this appropriations bill for family planning. If you look, and we will do this again later, at one country after another, we have seen doubling and tripling, quadrupling even, of money going to countries, especially in Africa, for family planning under the Mexico City policy.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us keeps the global gag rule intact, with one important exception. It would allow for the provision of contraceptives, not direct funding, to foreign NGOs to help reduce abortion, unintended pregnancy, and the spread of HIV/AIDS. The amendment I offer today makes absolutely clear that no funding would be provided to international organizations that do not comply with the Mexico City policy. In addition, the provision provides absolutely no assistance for abortion.

This is strictly prohibited in 10 other sections of the bill. Every provision in this bill has been kept there that forbids U.S. dollars going to abortion.

There are tremendous unmet needs for contraception in developing countries that most need this assistance to address population and health crises, including the spread of HIV/AIDS and unintended and high-risk pregnancies.

The global gag rule has only made matters worse for decreasing access in many countries. U.S. shipments of contraceptives have ceased to 20 developing nations, including in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. In some areas, the largest distribution centers for contraceptives have experienced decreased access for over 50 percent of the women they serve. This decline in access to contraceptives has led to increases in unintended pregnancy and in the number of women seeking postabortion care.

It is clear that withholding contraceptives, my friends, does not reduce abortion. Providing contraceptives is the way to reduce unintended pregnancies and abortions. The numbers speak for themselves. Increased use of contraceptives in the last two decades has been accompanied by significant declines in abortion rates in a number of countries. For example, in Russia, the abortion rate declined by 61 percent, as has been mentioned, between 1988 and 2001, as modern contraceptive use increased by 74 percent.

Proponents of the Smith amendment will make several false claims. They

may say that this provision would provide funding or assistance for services and products other than contraceptives directly to international NGOs who are not compliant with Mexico City. It absolutely will not.

□ 1715

They will argue that the Smith amendment will not cut family planning funds in this bill. However, it will dramatically decrease the effectiveness of our international family planning aid by withholding contraceptives to the areas of the world that need them most to prevent unintended pregnancies, abortions and the spread of HIV-AIDS.

The other side will also say that my provision encourages abortion as a means of family planning. Nothing could be further from the truth. Abortion is already illegal in many of the areas that would receive contraceptives under my provision, particularly in African countries. Furthermore, these organizations do not promote abortion as a means of family planning. They provide family planning to prevent unintended pregnancies, thereby reducing abortion.

You may also hear that by providing contraceptives, these organizations will be able to use their own funds for other purposes prohibited by Mexico City. I have already made clear the incredible unmet need for contraceptives. In Uganda alone, the average number of births per woman is 7.1, while the unmet need for family planning is reported by married women at 35 percent. The bill will provide donated contraceptives, not funding, to groups that are unable to provide enough contraceptives in areas with severe shortages.

Furthermore, contraceptives are not fungible. They are used for contraception. Period. By filling the unmet need for contraceptives, each year we can prevent 52 million unwanted pregnancies, an estimated 29 million abortions, 142,000 pregnancy-related deaths, and 505,000 children from losing their mothers.

It is clear that voting for the Smith amendment and against contraceptives is an extreme position that will in fact hurt our efforts to decrease abortion. So if you really want to decrease abortion, if you really say you are for family planning, if you really want to save lives, if you really want to decrease HIV/AIDS, which is spreading throughout the world, vote no on the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Smith-Stupak amendment, which is the only amendment before the House that would restore the Mexico City Policy. This policy is a vital, pro-life provision intended to protect the integrity of U.S. family planning programs around the

world by establishing a clear wall of separation between abortion and family planning. By directing support to organizations that agree not to promote or perform abortion as a method of family planning, we ensure that U.S.-supported programs are not in the abortion business.

Let me be clear: Our amendment does not, does not, reduce international family planning funding for services or contraceptives by a single penny. Instead, the policy that we are promoting improves the credibility of international family planning programs by ensuring that they are entirely separated from abortion activities.

Despite misleading statements to the contrary, the previous Lowey amendment is not about contraceptives or HIV. We have provisions in the legislation where that language can be put, and it would be perfectly acceptable to all of us. Instead, the Lowey amendments are a direct assault on the Mexico City Policy.

The Smith-Stupak amendment restores the Mexico City Policy and in no way reduces funding for contraceptives. U.S. family planning funded in this bill at \$441 million should be directed to organizations that do not promote or perform abortions.

The effort to prevent unplanned pregnancy by providing contraceptives continues robustly under the Mexico City Policy. As you can see from the chart here before me, U.S.-funded family planning increased dramatically in countries where USAID has found the need to be the greatest.

Mrs. LOWEY claims Ethiopia and some of these others have actually decreased money. It is simply not true. If you look, in Ethiopia funding has nearly quadrupled, increasing from \$4.9 million to \$19.5 million under the Mexico City Policy. In Uganda, funding has almost doubled, from \$5.2 million to \$9.8 million.

International family planning is funded at \$441 million in this bill, and it will still be funded at \$441 million in this bill under the Smith-Stupak amendment.

I would give the previous speaker, Mrs. LOWEY, credit for being ingenious. It is an ingenious amendment which really undermines the Mexico City language.

I urge all Members to support our pro-life and pro-family amendment. Support the Smith-Stupak amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), a distinguished member of the committee.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment does nothing to reinstate the Mexico City executive order. It is an executive order. What is in statute and what continues to be in statute, on page 93 of H.R. 2764, section 618, "None of the funds may be made available to be paid for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning."

On line 13, "None of the funds," and then it goes on to say, "may be used for the performance of involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide financial incentive to any person undergoing sterilization. None of the funds may be made available to carry out part of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that may be used to pay for biomedical research for the performance of abortions or involuntary sterilization." None of the funds. None of the funds. That is all protected in here. The Smith language doesn't change anything.

President George Bush in fact himself has said that one of the best ways to prevent an abortion is to provide quality family planning programs. And here are the facts, folks.

In developing countries, 120 million married couples would like to postpone their next pregnancy or have no more children, but they don't have access to modern contraceptives. In sub-Saharan Africa, 26 percent of the women who desire to delay or end their child bearing remain without access to volunteer family planning and then they risk an unintended pregnancy. Every year more than 525,000 women die from causes related to pregnancy in childbirth, with 99 percent of these deaths occurring in developing countries. An additional 8 million women each year suffer needless complications from pregnancy and birth. And lack of spacing birth, this is really key, because I have spoken to women in Africa and in Latin America, lack of spacing birth results in intervals of 9 to 14 months, which raises the increased maternal death rate by 250 percent.

Vote for voluntary family planning. Vote for 22 more additional countries receiving voluntary planning. Vote against Smith.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Smith-Stupak amendment that guards against policies that would lead to taxpayer funding of abortions abroad. This amendment would ensure that the Mexico City Policy is included in this spending bill.

The Mexico City Policy, first enacted by President Reagan in 1984 and reinstated in 2001, ensures that organizations that do international population assistance work and that promote abortion as a method of family planning do not receive United States funding.

This is a critical policy that underscores the sanctity of human life by telling groups that if they want to promote abortion, they better find a source of funding other than the U.S. taxpayer. It is quite simple: If a group demonstrates a disregard for human life, they don't get funding.

Let me be clear, the Mexico City policy and this funding do not reduce

funding for family planning programs. The focus instead is on channeling funds to organizations that agree not to promote abortion. There is, therefore, no overall reduction of family planning funds. Again, the guidelines are simple. If you promote abortion, the U.S. Government will not be giving you money.

Under the current language in the State-Foreign Operations appropriation bill, funding would once again flow to groups that promote abortion. The Smith-Stupak amendment would eliminate language that allows funding to go to even the most aggressively pro-abortion groups.

This amendment is about our Nation's abortion policy. As such, it is entirely focused on ensuring our government does not fund groups that promote abortion. I support this amendment because it wisely guards against any erosion of our protection of the sanctity of human life.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), an outstanding member of the committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and once again for her very valiant efforts to save lives of women and children throughout the world.

Let me first say I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment. This bill includes a very narrow provision to allow foreign NGOs to receive only U.S.-provided contraceptives. Chairwoman LOWEY has additionally offered the amendment that clarifies the existing language in the bill to make it absolutely clear that this provision only allows for the donation of the contraceptives.

This provision has absolutely nothing to do with funding. The bill does not provide financial assistance to clinics or to NGOs. It simply allows those family planning organizations that have been denied USAID family planning funding under the global gag rule to receive contraceptives from USAID and domestic NGOs.

Again, it has nothing to do with providing assistance for abortions, which are already strictly and clearly prohibited in 10 other provisions in this bill, which, I must say, I am very disappointed with. But the fact is that those provisions are there.

By providing contraceptives, we will actually help to reduce abortions, reduce the spread of HIV and AIDS and save the lives of mothers and infants by reducing the number of high-risk and unintended pregnancies.

The negative impact of the gag rule, which, of course, as I said earlier, and you all know this, this bill leaves the gag rule in place, but the negative impact is well documented. Since it was reinstated in 2001, shipments of United States-donated contraceptives have ceased in 20 developing countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

The NGOs most affected are often the ones with the most extensive distribu-

tion networks and the largest outreach to young women in rural areas. They often provide the only family planning program in a region and they have suffered severely from the cutoff of contraceptive shipments. The Smith amendment would continue to punish these NGOs for running successful family planning programs and would effectively undermine the goal we all share to reduce abortions and HIV and AIDS around the world.

For the life of me, I don't understand why we are doing this, Mr. SMITH. You know and I know that this does not tamper with, unfortunately, the global gag rule or Mexico City language.

So let's be straightforward. Let's be honest. What we are trying to do today is just save the lives of women and children.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you, Mr. SMITH, for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Chairman, what this is about is a philosophical difference of how we approach things. This is about respect for life, our's and those in other countries. I commend the gentleman on the amendment, and I do rise in support of this amendment and of the Mexico City Policy and making certain that we pass the Smith-Stupak amendment. It will strike the language that would undermine that policy.

It is not going to take away the \$441 million for family planning. It is going to put a bright line of separation between abortion and family planning. The U.S. should not be in the business of exporting abortion overseas. It has been a tragedy for women here in the U.S., and it will carry the same hurt, it will carry the same trauma if it is used abroad.

So I commend the gentleman for his amendment. I rise in support.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN).

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it bears repeating, the statistics we have heard so many times about the language that is in this bill and what is not in this bill. There are at least 10 provisions in the bill that prohibit U.S. foreign assistance from being used to promote or perform abortions. In many of these countries, abortion is illegal. That could not be more clear.

I want to thank Chairwoman LOWEY for her leadership on this bill and for including this commonsense, common ground, family planning provision to include contraceptives only, and not funding.

I rise today in strong support of both the Lowey amendment and of the contraceptives-only provision in the bill, and in opposition to the Smith amendment.

Under current U.S. policy, too many people in the developing world, especially Africa, contraceptives are in short supply, placing the health and

well-being of millions of people at risk. President Bush has recognized the crisis and proposed a major Africa initiative.

The very specific and narrowly tailored language of Chairwoman LOWEY's language allows the U.S. to provide contraceptives only so NGOs can provide contraceptives in developing countries. This provision is, as I say, a commonsense, common ground solution to a very real problem. This provision will reduce the number of unintended pregnancies, help prevent abortions and help stem the spread of disease, including HIV-AIDS.

The far-reaching impacts of this provision are immeasurable. This will make a substantive difference in the lives of women and families around the world by allowing them to protect themselves and plan and space their births. It will help slow rapid population growth, which results in poverty and instability. It will help stop the spread of HIV-AIDS.

I urge all my colleagues who are committed to family planning to oppose the Smith amendment, vote to support the Lowey amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend Congressman SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. STUPAK, which seeks to restore the Mexico City Policy. It is a longstanding guideline for receiving U.S. family planning assistance.

This policy, as we know, prevents U.S. funding for foreign nongovernmental organizations, NGOs, that perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning. This standard is consistent with our domestic policy, as regulations prohibit taxpayer dollars from programs that support abortion as a method of family planning.

The Mexico City Policy applies the same standard of domestic funding to global family planning, and therefore reinforces the belief that the fundamental goal of family planning programs should be to reduce abortions. By eliminating the Mexico City Policy, we are devaluing the importance of other preventative methods of family planning.

As the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am seriously concerned about the effect that such a policy change would have on our ability to protect the respect for innocent human life and human rights worldwide.

□ 1730

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment.

We have heard it so many times before, but the global gag rule is not about abortion. It is about women dying to the tune of 600,000 a year. That is equal to one or two jumbo jets crashing each day. The fact remains that, since 1973, no U.S. Federal funds have been or are being used around the world for abortions.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that they respect life, but during the time that we have been debating this bill, 65 women around the world will die from pregnancy because of many related complications; and they are dying because they do not have access to the most basic health care such as contraceptives.

I commend my colleague, Mrs. LOWEY, for her commonsense approach to refining the global gag rule. Although I support a full repeal of the global gag rule, it would be unconstitutional in our country, and it is unconscionable that we are exporting it to the world's poorest women.

But the Lowey amendment merely allows NGOs and organizations to receive contraceptives, which are proven to prevent unintended pregnancies, abortions and sexually transmitted diseases. That is what it does. It is family planning.

So I ask my colleagues, what do we tell a Somalian mother whose teenage daughter has just died in childbirth? Do we explain there are some politicians in Washington who do not think that she deserves the same information and health care services that their own daughters have?

These programs are about saving women and girls' lives and helping both men and women get access to reproductive health services. So if you oppose abortion and oppose the spread of HIV/AIDS, it makes common sense, good sense to support access to contraceptives and oppose the Smith amendment. Support the Lowey provision.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith-Stupak amendment.

I believe women in developing nations, these poor women are not asking help to abort their children. They are asking for help with food, housing and medical care for them and their families. It costs roughly \$5 to spray a house with the cheapest insecticide to protect entire families from being infected with malaria.

The drug Nevirapine reduces the risk of prenatal HIV infection by 50 percent. One dose is given to the mother and one to the baby, and these two doses only cost \$5.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is how our foreign aid dollars should be spent, saving lives, not destroying them. Most preventable child deaths are from malnutrition, diarrhea, pneumonia, infections of newborns and malaria.

The United States has contributed more than \$1.5 billion in the last 5

years to treat almost 5 billion episodes of child diarrhea with lifesaving oral rehydration therapy, and we have reduced deaths from diarrheal disease by more than half since 1990.

These are the success stories of how U.S. tax dollars are saving lives, and we need to continue to preserve lives. The money in this bill should be spent on newborn care programs and not on destructive abortion procedures destroying the life of the child and harming women.

I believe we need to export lifesaving policy that provides poor women with the food, with the housing and the medicine that they need so desperately.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Let me say at the outset, I have the deepest respect for the opinions expressed in this Chamber. I may not agree with them, but I respect them.

We are all try to reduce unintended pregnancies. We are all trying to reduce abortion. In contrast to what a prior speaker said, there is nobody here in this Congress, right or left, who doesn't have respect for human life; and that kind of verbiage really ought not to be expressed in this Chamber.

I will say, however, that while I respect my opponents' arguments, the arguments do lose some credibility on the issue of fungibility. The fact of the matter is, as has been stated before, not one penny in Mrs. LOWEY's bill is spent promoting or providing abortion. It is on in-kind contraceptives.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have said, whoa, whoa, but that is promoting the funding of abortion, because every single in-kind contraceptive that is donated means that there is more money by that country to fund an abortion.

Well, if you are going to apply that argument, my friends, then you better just admit defeat on the global war on terror right now. Because the fact of the matter is that many of the same countries that we are providing in-kind military assistance to to help us in the global war on terror allow for legal abortion. Some even provide abortion services.

Here is a map. If you are going to argue the fungibility issue, then in fact every time that we provide funding to Pakistan, we are promoting abortions, because in some cases abortion is legal in Pakistan.

Every time we are providing military funding and assistance to India, we are promoting abortions. Australia, Japan, South Korea. When we are providing funding for the Colombian antidrug initiative, we are promoting abortions in Colombia under that argument. Canada. Russia. When we provide military assistance to secure loose nukes in Russia, under your argument that money is fungible. They can take our

assistance, secure the loose nukes and then use that money in order to provide and promote abortions.

If you use that argument, my friends, you need to go back to your districts today and admit to your constituents that every time you have supported that military aid you have supported abortion, because the money is fungible.

The Czech Republic. Many of you support providing military assistance and in-kind assistance to the Czech Republic for the national missile defense system. They permit abortions. Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, NATO countries, South Africa, the Ukraine.

The fact of the matter is that the fungibility argument has no credibility. You can only have fungibility if you have money. There is no money in this bill for abortion services.

If we are going to have an honest debate on this issue, let's be honest and let's be consistent. What this language does is say we want to reduce unintended pregnancies. We want to reduce abortions. The way to do it is to allow for in-kind contributions of contraceptives. This is important language.

I oppose the amendment, and I urge Members to be consistent.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds just to say that the previous speaker's comments missed by a mile what this is all about.

The Mexico City policy does not apply to a single country. It applies to organizations. Countries are expressly excluded from Mexico City policy. It is all about pro-abortion organizations, and whether or not we want to enrich and enable them to expand abortion. We want to put our money and in-kind contributions to those that have divested themselves from the killing of unborn children.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith-Stupak amendment and encourage my colleagues to support this measure to prevent the U.S.-taxpayer-funded export of abortion.

The purpose of U.S. foreign assistance is to strengthen the foundation for international stability by fostering civil society, supporting institutions that foster self-determination, and helping the vulnerable by bringing healing and hope and basic sustenance.

As a leading provider of foreign assistance worldwide, the United States has made extraordinary strides towards alleviating suffering throughout the world. Unfortunately, an element of the Foreign Operations bill before us today risks undermining this noble legacy.

The Mexico City policy, first announced by President Reagan in 1984, requires that as a condition for receiving Federal funds for family planning, foreign nongovernmental organizations

agree that they will neither perform abortions nor lobby to change abortion laws or otherwise actively promote abortion as a method of family planning.

The Foreign Operations bill, as it currently stands, would undo this policy and subsidize abortion providers overseas. U.S. taxpayers should not be forced to do this, nor should other countries be forced to accept it. Abortion is so often the result of abandonment, Mr. Chairman; and I believe women deserve better.

Mr. Chairman, many Americans aren't comfortable about the rightness or wrongness of it. Many Americans are unsure in their heart of hearts about the ethics of abortion. Americans agonize about this difficult issue, and our collective experience as a society demonstrates the grave consequences.

Given these considerations, is abortion really the best we can offer to some of the most vulnerable populations in the world? Is this really how we wish to be identified as a Nation?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to retain the long-standing Mexico City policy and not to compromise the reputation and legitimacy of our foreign assistance programs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Before I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California, I would like to yield an additional 30 seconds for clarification to my good friend from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman.

I do seek a clarification. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey attempted to clarify, but I am now a little more confused. As I understood his argument, he said that when an organization promotes abortion, we are looking to punish it. But when a country that we happen to like promotes abortion, then we can provide them with \$300 million or \$400 million in budget support.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. First of all, we are not punishing. We are saying that, as a matter of human rights principle, that the killing of an unborn child rises to a sufficient level that we will pick other NGOs to whom we will give our dollars.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, maybe, just maybe, if a woman has access to contraceptives, abortion will be prevented.

What is wrong with you people? Where do you come from?

Oh, that's right, you come from the United States of America, where all women are allowed, rich or poor, to have access to and choices over family planning. Lucky us.

There are many choices for preventing unwanted pregnancies, and let

us not forget prevention of HIV/AIDS. If you are against abortion, at least support prevention. If you are concerned about HIV/AIDS, support contraception.

Our Nation has a long history of generosity and caring. That should not end today. What are we doing? We are up here with the Lowey amendment ensuring that women in the poorest villages in the poorest countries have access to contraceptives. We are doing that by providing medically approved and necessary contraceptives to women who would otherwise have no other means to prevent unwanted pregnancies and/or to prevent HIV/AIDS.

Unintended pregnancies and illegal abortions have been on the rise in areas where access to family planning has been denied. Chairwoman LOWEY's provision is just plain common sense. Let's put women's health above politics and vote "no" on the Smith-Stupak amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Smith-Stupak amendment. The Mexico City policy does not reduce family planning funding at all. It only requires that funds, support and supplies are directed to NGOs that do not promote abortion as part of family planning.

U.S. taxpayers should not be forced to hand their hard-earned tax money over to organizations that practice policies that these taxpayers morally oppose. The Mexico City policy has established that clear bright line that allows us to provide assistance in a morally acceptable manner.

President Bush has clearly indicated his intent to veto this bill if it weakens current Federal policies and laws on abortion or that encourages the destruction of human life at any stage. Enough of us, myself included, have pledged to sustain this veto that it will, indeed, be sustained.

We must ensure that taxpayer funds do not underwrite organizations that perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning. I urge my colleagues to support the Smith-Stupak amendment today.

□ 1745

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I unfortunately must rise in opposition to the Smith-Stupak amendment. I have great respect for the passion displayed by Mr. SMITH and Mr. STUPAK and I share their opposition to abortion. However, in this instance I must strongly disagree with their decision to prevent the distribution of contraception to some of the most poor and needy people and nations in the world.

Mr. Chairman, we are asked to make an important decision in this year's debate on the Foreign Operations bill. Our commitment to providing international family planning speaks volumes about who we are as a nation. These funds reach some of the most vulnerable populations in the world and can literally mean the difference between life and death.

I know that Americans regardless of their position on abortion are horrified by the statistics on HIV/AIDS in Africa and the number of unwanted pregnancies and abortions throughout the developing world. I believe that it is our responsibility, as people committed to the sanctity of life and the basic human dignity of all people, to respond to this crisis. I believe that it is also our responsibility to do so in the most effective manner possible while staying true to our core values. The language that Chairwoman LOWEY proposes makes it possible for the United States to provide developing nations access to contraceptive products, products that save lives. The Lowey language ensures that the organizations best equipped to distribute these products to the neediest, poorest parts of the world are able to do so. Finally, it respects the law of the land that prohibits Federal financial assistance to organizations that provide abortions or abortion counseling.

I know that crafting this language was no easy feat and I commend Mrs. LOWEY for her dedication to moving forward with a bill that reflects the values of our Nation and respects the strong feelings that Members have on both sides of the abortion debate. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Smith-Stupak amendment and allow this critical, lifesaving assistance to reach those who so desperately need it.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Dr. DAVE WELDON.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I just want to clarify a point just made by the gentleman from Rhode Island. Under the Smith language, contraceptive devices will be distributed. This whole debate is about whether we're going to give contraceptives to Planned Parenthood, Parenthood International, aggressively trying to overturn the pro-life laws in countries all over the world.

We have dramatically increased distribution under Mexico City of contraceptive devices. Ethiopia, from 4.9 million to 19.5 million. A big, long list here. This is about Planned Parenthood and their effort to overturn pro-life laws all over the world and we don't want to give money to them. That's what this debate is about.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. First of all, I would like to thank Mr. SMITH and Mr. STUPAK for their leadership on this amendment. What we are doing here on this amendment is no small thing.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it should be noted for the record that most Americans do not believe that abortion is an appropriate form of family planning. To suggest it is simply wrong. It would never be considered proper within the United States and it isn't proper that taxpayers' money be spent for this purpose overseas.

The amendment that we are debating today in question is not anti-family planning. There are a number of alternatives to abortion which do not rise to the level of concern that this proposal engenders. This is only anti-family planning if one considers abortion to be a method of family planning. I reject this way of thinking and urge the adoption of this amendment.

When President Bush adopted our Nation's current policy, he was right. Prohibiting the expenditure of taxpayer dollars to fund abortions outside the United States is a policy that has been in place for many years. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues who care about the sanctity of human life to vote in favor of the Smith-Stupak amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. May I ask how much time is remaining on both sides, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York has 30 seconds. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3¼ minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and the Congressman from Michigan for their work on this amendment and their longstanding commitment to protecting human life.

This is about two fundamental issues that have been talked about here on the floor. First, taxpayer dollars shouldn't go to organizations, whether those dollars are cash or in-kind, shouldn't go to organizations that perform or promote the taking of innocent human life. Second, it recognizes the more fundamental principle, life is precious, life is sacred, and government's fundamental responsibility is to protect the weak from the strong, to protect those innocent individuals whose lives are being taken.

This is good public policy. We should keep it in place. It's consistent, frankly, with our heritage and with our history. I always like to remind folks of what the founders said when they talked about that fundamental document that started this great experience we call America: Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It's interesting to note the order the founders placed the rights they chose

to mention. Can you pursue happiness, your goals and dreams, if you first don't have liberty? And do you ever have true liberty, true freedom, if government does not protect your most fundamental right, your right to live?

This amendment is consistent with the founders' vision, it's good policy, and we should adopt it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just would like to end this debate to say that we all have the same goals here. We all want to reduce the number of abortions. Nobody wants to celebrate it. I'm a pro-life Democrat. I voted for the ban on partial-birth abortion and I'm proud of my vote. But we do have an honest disagreement on how we reduce the number of unintended pregnancies. And to me it is clear that if we do not provide contraception to these poor women in these poor countries, then we will have more abortions. The statistics bear this out, the facts bear this out, and that's why this amendment needs to go down and we need to pass the chairwoman's language here, because I believe that if this amendment passes, there will be more abortions, not less.

And one final comment to the gentleman from New Jersey, we were not pressured to support this position. We came to this position by honestly looking at the facts. No leadership pressured us, me and Mr. LANGEVIN and those of us who have a different voting record than some people over here. So this is our choice. Please vote down this amendment and let's reduce the number of abortions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) control the remainder of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. I rise today in support of the Smith-Stupak amendment to strike the language eliminating the vitally important protections of the Mexico City Policy. I just believe it's wrong to force American taxpayers to subsidize organizations who actively promote abortion in foreign nations.

In response to some of the arguments on the other side that this is not about promoting abortion or not, I disagree. It's really not about providing contraceptives. This is about promoting abortion. Because as the gentleman from New Jersey was trying to say before he was cut off, there are NGOs that are in compliance with the Mexico City Policy which means that they neither perform nor actively promote abortions as a method of family planning in other nations. It is they who are eligible for assistance under the Mexico City Policy. It is they who should be getting

the benefit, not those organizations that are promoting abortions around the world that can substitute the provision of these contraceptives to then use that money available to go and pursue their other agenda.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Smith-Stupak amendment to restore the pro-life Mexico City Policy protections that were effectively stripped from this bill.

Human life is a precious commodity and around the globe it is still too often taken for granted. Like millions, in my heart and in my mind, I believe that life begins at conception. And as a Member of this body, I feel I have an obligation to protect the right to life wherever I can. The most effective way to do that now, today, is to support the Mexico City Policy which would prevent our international aid from going to foreign organizations that support or promote abortions.

This policy is based on the simple idea that American taxpayers should not be forced to export abortions with their money. Again, we're talking about taking money away from the American taxpayer and using it to subsidize foreign abortions. For most, this defies common sense. It defies fiscal sense. And it is reprehensible to the millions who believe in the fundamental right to life.

I urge all Members to support the Smith-Stupak amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Stupak-Smith amendment. This amendment very simply ensures that our taxpayer Foreign Operation funds will not be used to support abortion overseas. The Mexico City Policy, which was first instituted in 1984 by President Ronald Reagan, simply states that any U.S. funding for family planning cannot be used to promote abortions as a suitable option in family planning.

As divisive as this issue is among many Americans, this issue is a consensus issue. The American people know whatever your view of abortion, whether it is morally right or morally acceptable, most Americans agree that it is morally wrong to take the taxpayer dollars of millions of Americans who cherish the sanctity of human life and use it to fund and to underwrite organizations that promote abortion overseas.

It is precisely for that reason that I rise today in strong support of this thoughtful amendment and urge my colleagues to preserve the Mexico City Policy and vote "aye" on the Stupak-Smith amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, recently a new organization formed in the United States called the Silent No More Awareness Campaign. It is made up entirely of women who have had abortions. One of the women, Dr. Alveda King, niece of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, has had two abortions. She is now one of the most passionate spokeswomen on earth in favor of the unborn child and in favor of protecting women from abortion and assisting women harmed and wounded by abortion. She has pointed out that women in America, and increasingly in the world in countries where it has been legalized, become the walking wounded and carry with them the deep emotional and physical scars of having had an abortion under the cheap sophistry choice. Dr. King used to be on the other side of the issue and she, like the other women in Silent No More, are now adamantly pro-life. Dr. King and so many others call on us today to defend life and not export abortion.

The Appropriations bill on the floor today provides \$441 million for overseas family planning. That is in the bill. It's untouched by the Smith-Stupak amendment. But who we give grant money or in-kind donations to matters. When you pour in-kind contributions into pro-abortion organizations whose *raison d'être*, and just read their literature and Web sites and look at what they're doing in those countries, is to legalize abortion on demand and to promote abortion by way of clinics, you realize that a vote against the Smith-Stupak amendment is a vote to enable abortion on demand.

Abortion is child abuse. That may not be something nice to say on this floor, some of you may cringe over it because you think it's all about choice. Choice to do what? Dismember, chemically poison a child. These are children. Welcome to 2007. Ultrasound technology has shattered the myth that an unborn child is not human or not alive. Birth is an event that happens to each and every one of us. It's not the beginning of life.

□ 1800

Prenatal surgery has shattered myths concerning the unborn as well. Unborn children are patients. So let's give the money to the family planners overseas that are all about family planning, not abortion promotion.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I cannot let that go unanswered. We are

not promoting abortion. We are trying to reduce the number of abortions by providing contraception.

The fact of the matter is the Republican party has no plan on reducing the number of abortions, none. There is only one way to do it, and you provide contraception to poor people. That's what we are trying to do.

You're right. It's not about who's getting; it's about who's not getting. There are poor women who are not getting contraception and contraceptives. We are trying to provide it.

I commend what you are trying to do. We are trying to reduce number of abortions, and all the explicit details of an abortion procedure are exactly why we are trying to do this.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear in closing, we all may have different views about abortion. I respect your views. I may differ. Each person is entitled to their own conscience and their own views on abortion.

But this is not about abortion. Every provision forbidding U.S. dollars going to abortion is in this bill, and it remains in this bill. The choice is clear, my friend.

My amendment will provide donated contraceptives, reduce unintended pregnancies, reduce the number of abortions, prevent HIV/AIDS, save lives, save the lives of millions of poor people around the world. This amendment will save lives. Mr. SMITH's amendment will lead to more abortions, put more lives at risk.

My friend, the choice is very clear. If you want to reduce the number of unintended pregnancies, if you want to save lives, if you want to prevent abortion, you vote for the Lowey amendment and against the Smith amendment.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by both the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. STUPAK and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH.

This amendment would simply reaffirm our country's long standing commitment to not using federal taxpayer money to fund or support abortions. More specifically, this amendment would preserve the decades-old, internationally agreed upon Mexico City Policy that defends the sanctity of life by preventing taxpayer dollars from funding overseas family planning organizations that promote or perform abortions.

Mr. Chairman, while many Americans may disagree on the issue of abortion, a vast majority of them do not believe that abortions should be publicly funded. This Mexico City Policy significantly prevents the exploitation of developing nations where some non-governmental organizations aggressively advocate the use of abortion as birth control—birth control, Mr. Chairman. The tactics of these NGOs are simply and utterly unconscionable, and I know Americans don't want their tax dollars funding these activities.

Now, opponents of the amendment have tried to assert that it would take away funding from international family planning. Quite to the

contrary, this Amendment does not take one single cent from these activities, but rather maintains the current policy preventing Federal funding of foreign abortions. We must remain resolute in the preservation of this policy.

Having practiced as a pro-life OB-GYN for nearly 30 years, I firmly believe that we have an obligation to protect life at each and every stage—and this obligation does not just apply to unborn Americans.

Any human life—regardless of geography, regardless of circumstance—has the right to exist. Foreign abortions are just as tragic as abortions here at home.

We should not and we cannot allow the Mexico City Policy to be abandoned. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support Stupak/Smith.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the amendment to reinstate the Mexico City Policy. This policy ensures that U.S. bilateral family planning programs are not conduits for exporting abortions internationally.

Let me be clear from the beginning: the Mexico City Policy is NOT anti-family planning. In no way does this policy reduce the \$425 million that the United States provides in family planning assistance. What this amendment does do is to put a wall between contraception and abortion, thereby preventing this Congress from making the American taxpayers an implicit partner in the aborting of unborn children. It sends the message that as Americans, we stand for the life and liberty of all individuals—those whose voices can be heard, and those whose voices cry from the womb.

This Democrat-led Congress has voted to protect roosters from cockfighting and horses from slaughter. Doesn't it would seem logical that this Congress would stand up and protect the fragile lives of the unborn?

But this Congress has shown that it is only selectively sympathetic to the furtherance of life. As when horses are killed, or roosters are hurt. But not when a tiny, human life is stamped out with the approval of our government.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment before us.

The Foreign Operations Appropriations measure in its current form will reduce the number of unintended pregnancies globally, curb the deadly spread of HIV/AIDS, and improve infant and maternal survival rates throughout the developing world.

I want to commend my friend and colleague, Congresswoman LOWEY, for including a provision in this measure which provides a targeted exemption from the Global Gag Rule.

This will allow NGOs to receive U.S.-donated contraception and condoms.

For the past 6 years, the global gag rule has jeopardized access to comprehensive health care for women in developing countries. It has denied NGOs the resources they need to provide necessary medical advice and treatments.

The intent of the Global Gag Rule was to restrict abortion. However, by denying access to contraception and condoms, the Gag Rule denies women the opportunity to prevent unintended pregnancies in the first place.

With population levels rising and efforts to prevent the spread of HIV increasing, the demand for contraception is higher than ever.

More than 200 million women around the world want to control when they have children and protect themselves from HIV, but they can't do so because they lack access to condoms and contraception.

Since the Global Gag Rule was reinstated, shipments of contraceptives from the U.S. government have been denied to 20 developing countries throughout Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. Its effect on healthcare in these nations has been devastating.

In the face of this, the Smith amendment would deny access to contraception and condoms to some of our most valuable NGOs reaching at-risk people of all ages.

What would the impact of this cutoff be?

Consider that access to contraceptives would prevent an estimated 52 million unintended pregnancies each year.

That, in turn, would prevent 22 million abortions. It would also prevent 23 million unplanned births; 142,000 pregnancy-related deaths, and 1.4 million infant deaths.

Family planning helps women to have their children during the healthiest times for both mother and child. It has proved critical to the reduction of infant mortality in numerous developing countries.

Contraceptive access is also critical to disease prevention. According to the WHO, the leading cause of last year's 4.3 million new HIV cases was unprotected sex. Access to condoms is a matter of life and death.

And of those millions, how many were parents? More than 13 million children under the age of 15 have lost one or both parents to AIDS. That is 12 percent of all the orphaned children in the world—more than 10 million children.

Cutting off the flow of contraceptives would be an enormous step back for the health of the world's women, children and families. The underlying bill before us takes a common-sense approach to global health that will reduce unintended pregnancies and the need for abortion. It will also help stop the spread of HIV/AIDS and improve infant and child survival rates.

This amendment would take us in the opposite direction. I urge all of my colleagues to vote no on the Smith/Stupak amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

An amendment by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 201, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

AYES—223

Abercrombie	Giffords	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Gilchrest	Murphy (CT)
Allen	Gillibrand	Murphy, Patrick
Andrews	Gonzalez	Nadler
Arcuri	Gordon	Napolitano
Baca	Granger	Neal (MA)
Baird	Green, Al	Norton
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Oberstar
Barrow	Grijalva	Obeys
Bean	Gutierrez	Olver
Becerra	Hall (NY)	Pallone
Berkley	Hare	Pascarell
Berman	Harman	Pastor
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Biggert	Herseth Sandlin	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Hill	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Hinchev	Price (NC)
Bono	Hinojosa	Pryce (OH)
Boswell	Hirono	Ramstad
Boucher	Hobson	Rangel
Boyd (FL)	Hodes	Reyes
Boyda (KS)	Holt	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Honda	Ross
Braley (IA)	Hooley	Rothman
Brown, Corrine	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Inslie	Ruppersberger
Capito	Israel	Rush
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Jackson-Lee	Salazar
Cardoza	(TX)	Sánchez, Linda
Carnahan	Jefferson	T.
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Schakowsky
Castle	Jones (OH)	Schiff
Castor	Kagen	Schwartz
Chandler	Kennedy	Scott (GA)
Christensen	Kilpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clarke	Kind	Serrano
Clay	Kirk	Sestak
Cleaver	Klein (FL)	Shays
Clyburn	Kucinich	Shea-Porter
Cohen	Lampson	Sherman
Conyers	Langevin	Sires
Cooper	Lantos	Slaughter
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Lee
Crowley	Lee	Snyder
Cuellar	Levin	Solis
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Space
Davis (CA)	Loebback	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Davis, Tom	Lowe	Sutton
DeFazio	Lynch	Tanner
DeGette	Mahoney (FL)	Tauscher
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Dent	Matheson	Tierney
Dicks	Matsui	Towns
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Udall (CO)
Doggett	McCollum (MN)	Udall (NM)
Doyle	McDermott	Upton
Edwards	McGovern	Van Hollen
Ellison	McNerney	Velázquez
Emanuel	McNulty	Visclosky
Engel	Meehan	Walden (OR)
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Walz (MN)
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Wasserman
Faleomavaega	Michaud	Schultz
Farr	Miller (NC)	Waters
Fattah	Miller, George	Watson
Filner	Mitchell	Watt
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Waxman
Frelinghuysen	Moore (WI)	

Welch (VT)
Wexler

Woolsey
Wu

Wynn
Yarmuth

NOES—201

Aderholt	Gerlach	Murtha
Akin	Gillmor	Musgrave
Alexander	Gingrey	Myrick
Altmire	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Goode	Nunes
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pearce
Baker	Graves	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Hall (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Bartlett (MD)	Hastert	Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Bilbray	Hayes	Pitts
Bilirakis	Heller	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Poe
Blackburn	Herger	Porter
Blunt	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Boehner	Holden	Putnam
Boozman	Hulshof	Radanovich
Bordallo	Inglis (SC)	Rahall
Boren	Issa	Regula
Boustany	Jindal	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Johnson (IL)	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Renzi
Brown-Waite,	Jones (NC)	Reynolds
Ginny	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Kanjorski	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Kaptur	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Keller	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Kildee	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	King (IA)	Roskam
Camp (MI)	King (NY)	Royce
Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	Kline (MN)	Sali
Cantor	Knollenberg	Saxton
Carter	Kuhl (NY)	Schmidt
Chabot	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Lamborn	Sessions
Cole (OK)	Latham	Shadegg
Conaway	LaTourette	Shimkus
Costello	Lewis (CA)	Shuler
Crenshaw	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Culberson	Linder	Skelton
Davis (KY)	Lipinski	Smith (NE)
Davis, David	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Lincoln	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Souder
Diaz-Balart, L.	E.	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Mack	Stupak
Donnelly	Manzullo	Tancred
Doolittle	Marchant	Taylor
Drake	Marshall	Terry
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Duncan	McCauley (TX)	Tiahrt
Ehlers	McCotter	Tiberi
Ellsworth	McCrery	Turner
Emerson	McHenry	Walberg
English (PA)	McHugh	Walsh (NY)
Everett	McIntyre	Wamp
Fallin	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Feeney	McMorris	Weller
Ferguson	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Flake	Melancon	Whitfield
Forbes	Mica	Wicker
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Fossella	Miller (MI)	Wilson (OH)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Mollohan	Wolf
Gallely	Moran (KS)	Young (AK)
Garrett (NJ)	Murphy, Tim	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bonner	Fortuño	Sanchez, Loretta
Cramer	Hunter	Simpson
Cubin	Ortiz	Sullivan
Davis (AL)	Paul	Weiner
Davis, Jo Ann	Pickering	

□ 1825

Ms. FALLIN changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CONYERS and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the

gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 218, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

AYES—205

Aderholt	Gillmor	Musgrave
Akin	Gingrey	Myrick
Alexander	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Altmire	Goode	Nunes
Bachmann	Goodlatte	Obstar
Bachus	Granger	Pearce
Baker	Graves	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Hall (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Bartlett (MD)	Hastert	Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Bilbray	Hayes	Pitts
Bilirakis	Heller	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Poe
Blackburn	Herger	Porter
Blunt	Hobson	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hoekstra	Putnam
Boozman	Holden	Radanovich
Bordallo	Hulshof	Rahall
Boren	Inglis (SC)	Regula
Boustany	Issa	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Jindal	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Johnson (IL)	Renzi
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
Ginny	Jones (NC)	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Kanjorski	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Kaptur	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Keller	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Kildee	Roskam
Camp (MI)	King (IA)	Royce
Campbell (CA)	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Cannon	Kingston	Sali
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Saxton
Capito	Knollenberg	Schmidt
Carter	Kuhl (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	LaHood	Sessions
Coble	Lamborn	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Latham	Shimkus
Conaway	LaTourette	Shuler
Costello	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Crenshaw	Lewis (KY)	Skelton
Culberson	Linder	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Davis, David	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Davis, Lincoln	Lucas	Souder
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, L.	E.	Stupak
Diaz-Balart, M.	Mack	Tancred
Donnelly	Manzullo	Taylor
Doolittle	Marchant	Terry
Drake	Marshall	Thornberry
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Tiahrt
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Tiberi
Ehlers	McCotter	Turner
Ellsworth	McCrery	Upton
Emerson	McHenry	Walberg
English (PA)	McHugh	Walsh (NY)
Everett	McIntyre	Wamp
Fallin	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Feeney	McMorris	Weller
Ferguson	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Flake	Melancon	Wicker
Forbes	Mica	Wilson (NM)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Wilson (OH)
Fossella	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Franks (AZ)	Mollohan	Young (AK)
Gallely	Moran (KS)	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Murphy, Tim	
Gerlach	Murtha	

NOES—218

Abercrombie	Allen	Arcuri
Ackerman	Andrews	Baca

Baird	Gordon	Napolitano
Baldwin	Green, Al	Neal (MA)
Barrow	Green, Gene	Norton
Bean	Grijalva	Obey
Becerra	Gutierrez	Oliver
Berkley	Hall (NY)	Pallone
Berman	Hare	Pascarell
Berry	Harman	Pastor
Biggart	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Herseth Sandlin	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Hill	Price (NC)
Bono	Hinchee	Pryce (OH)
Boswell	Hinojosa	Ramstad
Boucher	Hirono	Rangel
Boyd (FL)	Hodes	Reyes
Boyd (KS)	Holt	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Honda	Ross
Braley (IA)	Hooley	Rothman
Brown, Corrine	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Inslee	Ruppersberger
Capps	Israel	Rush
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cardoza	Jackson-Lee	Salazar
Carnahan	(TX)	Sanchez, Linda
Carney	Jefferson	T.
Carson	Johnson (GA)	Sarbanes
Castle	Johnson, E. B.	Schakowsky
Castor	Jones (OH)	Schiff
Chandler	Kagen	Schwartz
Christensen	Kennedy	Scott (GA)
Clarke	Kilpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kind	Serrano
Cleaver	Kirk	Sestak
Clyburn	Klein (FL)	Shays
Cohen	Kucinich	Shea-Porter
Conyers	Lampson	Sherman
Cooper	Langevin	Sires
Costa	Lantos	Slaughter
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Snyder
Cuellar	Lee	Solis
Cummings	Levin	Space
Davis (AL)	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Davis (CA)	Loebach	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sutton
Davis, Tom	Lowey	Tanner
DeFazio	Lynch	Tauscher
DeGette	Mahoney (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Markey	Tierney
Dent	Matheson	Towns
Dicks	Matsui	Udall (CO)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Udall (NM)
Doggett	McCollum (MN)	Van Hollen
Doyle	McDermott	Velázquez
Edwards	McGovern	Visclosky
Ellison	McNerney	Walden (OR)
Emanuel	McNulty	Walsh (MN)
Engel	Meehan	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Schultz
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Waters
Faleomavaega	Michaud	Watson
Farr	Miller (NC)	Watt
Fattah	Miller, George	Waxman
Finer	Mitchell	Welch (VT)
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Wexler
Frelinghuysen	Moore (WI)	Woolsey
Giffords	Moran (VA)	Wu
Gilchrest	Murphy (CT)	Wynn
Gillibrand	Murphy, Patrick	Yarmuth
Gonzalez	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—14

Bonner	Hunter	Simpson
Cramer	Ortiz	Sullivan
Cubin	Paul	Weiner
Davis, Jo Ann	Pickering	Whitfield
Fortuño	Sanchez, Loretta	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1832

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have had conversations with Mr. BLUNT and I have also had conversations with Mr. OBEY, and I want to tell the Members

of the House that it would be my intention if we complete this bill and we can complete the Legislative appropriations bill tonight in the next 5½ hours, then it would be my intention that we would not meet tomorrow.

I want all the Members to understand that we will complete the Legislative appropriations bill this week, but if we can complete both of those bills tonight, it would be my intention that we would not be meeting tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

AFGHANISTAN

SEC. 623. Of the funds appropriated under titles III and IV of this Act, not less than \$1,057,050,000 shall be made available for humanitarian, reconstruction, and related assistance for Afghanistan: *Provided*, That of the funds made available pursuant to this section, \$3,000,000 should be made available for reforestation activities: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the previous proviso should be matched, to the maximum extent possible, with contributions from American and Afghan businesses: *Provided further*, That of the funds allocated for assistance for Afghanistan from this Act not less than \$75,000,000 shall be made available to support programs that directly address the needs of Afghan women and girls, including for the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission, the Afghan Ministry of Women's Affairs, and for women-led non-profit organizations in Afghanistan.

NOTIFICATION ON EXCESS DEFENSE EQUIPMENT

SEC. 624. Prior to providing excess Department of Defense articles in accordance with section 516(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations to the same extent and under the same conditions as are other committees pursuant to subsection (f) of that section: *Provided*, That before issuing a letter of offer to sell excess defense articles under the Arms Export Control Act, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the regular notification procedures of such Committees if such defense articles are significant military equipment (as defined in section 47(9) of the Arms Export Control Act) or are valued (in terms of original acquisition cost) at \$7,000,000 or more, or if notification is required elsewhere in this Act for the use of appropriated funds for specific countries that would receive such excess defense articles: *Provided further*, That such Committees shall also be informed of the original acquisition cost of such defense articles.

GLOBAL FUND ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 625. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, 20 percent of the funds that are appropriated by this Act for a contribution to support the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the "Global Fund") shall be withheld from obligation to the Global Fund until the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the Global Fund—

(1) is releasing incremental disbursements only if grantees demonstrate progress against clearly defined performance indicators;

(2) is providing support and oversight to country-level entities, such as country coordinating mechanisms, principal recipients, and Local Fund Agents (LFAs), to enable them to fulfill their mandates;

(3) has a full-time, professional, independent Office of Inspector General that is fully operational;

(4) requires LFAs to assess whether a principal recipient has the capacity to oversee the activities of sub-recipients;

(5) is making progress toward implementing a reporting system that breaks down grantee budget allocations by programmatic activity;

(6) has adopted a policy on the public release of documents produced by the Office of the Inspector General;

(7) is tracking and encouraging the involvement of civil society, including faith-based organizations, in country coordinating mechanisms and program implementation; and

(8) has provided to the Secretary of State a report on faith-based organizations as described in subsection (b).

(b) The report referred to in subsection (a)(8) is a report that provides a description and assessment of grants and sub-grants provided by the Global Fund to faith-based organizations. The report shall include—

(1) on a county-by-country basis—

(A) a description of the amount of grants and sub-grants provided to faith-based organizations; and

(B) an assessment of the extent to which faith-based organizations have been or are involved in the Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM) process of the Global Fund; and

(2) a description of actions the Global Fund has taken and will take to enhance the involvement of faith-based organizations in the CCM process, particularly in countries in which the involvement of faith-based organizations has been underrepresented.

PROHIBITION ON BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES

SEC. 626. (a) Funds appropriated for bilateral assistance under any heading of this Act and funds appropriated under any such heading in a provision of law enacted prior to the enactment of this Act, shall not be made available to any country which the President determines—

(1) grants sanctuary from prosecution to any individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism; or

(2) otherwise supports international terrorism.

(b) The President may waive the application of subsection (a) to a country if the President determines that national security or humanitarian reasons justify such waiver. The President shall publish each waiver in the Federal Register and, at least 15 days before the waiver takes effect, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the waiver (including the justification for the waiver) in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

DEBT-FOR-DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 627. In order to enhance the continued participation of nongovernmental organizations in debt-for-development and debt-for-nature exchanges, a nongovernmental organization which is a grantee or contractor of the United States Agency for International Development may place in interest bearing accounts local currencies which accrue to that organization as a result of economic assistance provided under title III of this Act and, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, any interest earned on such investment shall be used for the purpose for which the assistance was provided to that organization.

SEPARATE ACCOUNTS

SEC. 628. (a) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR LOCAL CURRENCIES.—

(1) If assistance is furnished to the government of a foreign country under chapters 1 and 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the

Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 under agreements which result in the generation of local currencies of that country, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall—

(A) require that local currencies be deposited in a separate account established by that government;

(B) enter into an agreement with that government which sets forth—

(i) the amount of the local currencies to be generated; and

(ii) the terms and conditions under which the currencies so deposited may be utilized, consistent with this section; and

(C) establish by agreement with that government the responsibilities of the United States Agency for International Development and that government to monitor and account for deposits into and disbursements from the separate account.

(2) USES OF LOCAL CURRENCIES.—As may be agreed upon with the foreign government, local currencies deposited in a separate account pursuant to subsection (a), or an equivalent amount of local currencies, shall be used only—

(A) to carry out chapter 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), for such purposes as—

(i) project and sector assistance activities; or

(ii) debt and deficit financing; or

(B) for the administrative requirements of the United States Government.

(3) PROGRAMMING ACCOUNTABILITY.—The United States Agency for International Development shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the equivalent of the local currencies disbursed pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(A) from the separate account established pursuant to subsection (a)(1) are used for the purposes agreed upon pursuant to subsection (a)(2).

(4) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Upon termination of assistance to a country under chapter 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), any unencumbered balances of funds which remain in a separate account established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be disposed of for such purposes as may be agreed to by the government of that country and the United States Government.

(5) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall report on an annual basis as part of the justification documents submitted to the Committees on Appropriations on the use of local currencies for the administrative requirements of the United States Government as authorized in subsection (a)(2)(B), and such report shall include the amount of local currency (and United States dollar equivalent) used and/or to be used for such purpose in each applicable country.

(b) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR CASH TRANSFERS.—

(1) If assistance is made available to the government of a foreign country, under chapter 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as cash transfer assistance or as non-project sector assistance, that country shall be required to maintain such funds in a separate account and not commingle them with any other funds.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Such funds may be obligated and expended notwithstanding provisions of law, which are inconsistent with the nature of this assistance including provisions which are referenced in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying House Joint Resolution 648 (House Report No. 98-1159).

(3) NOTIFICATION.—At least 15 days prior to obligating any such cash transfer or non-project sector assistance, the President shall submit a notification through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, which shall include a detailed description of how the funds proposed to be made available will be used, with a discussion of the United States interests that will be served by the assistance (including, as appropriate, a description of the economic policy reforms that will be promoted by such assistance).

(4) EXEMPTION.—Non-project sector assistance funds may be exempt from the requirements of subsection (b)(1) only through the notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

ENTERPRISE FUND RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 629. (a) Prior to the distribution of any assets resulting from any liquidation, dissolution, or winding up of an Enterprise Fund, in whole or in part, the President shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, a plan for the distribution of the assets of the Enterprise Fund.

(b) Funds made available under titles II through V of this Act for Enterprise Funds shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities.

FINANCIAL MARKET ASSISTANCE

SEC. 630. Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the headings "TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY", "DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE", "TRANSITION INITIATIVES", "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND", "INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE", "ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION", "NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TERRORISM, DEMINING AND RELATED PROGRAMS", and "ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND BALTIC STATES", not less than \$40,000,000 should be made available for building capital markets and financial systems in countries eligible to receive United States assistance.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE PEACE CORPS, INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION AND AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

SEC. 631. Unless expressly provided to the contrary, provisions of this or any other Act, including provisions contained in prior Acts authorizing or making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, shall not be construed to prohibit activities authorized by or conducted under the Peace Corps Act, the Inter-American Foundation Act or the African Development Foundation Act. The agency shall promptly report to the Committees on Appropriations whenever it is conducting activities or is proposing to conduct activities in a country for which assistance is prohibited.

IMPACT ON JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 632. None of the funds appropriated under titles II through V of this Act may be obligated or expended to provide—

(1) any financial incentive to a business enterprise currently located in the United States for the purpose of inducing such an enterprise to relocate outside the United States if such incentive or inducement is likely to reduce the number of employees of such business enterprise in the United States because United States production is being replaced by such enterprise outside the United States; or

(2) assistance for any program, project, or activity that contributes to the violation of internationally recognized workers rights, as defined in section 507(4) of the Trade Act of

1974, of workers in the recipient country, including any designated zone or area in that country: *Provided*, That the application of section 507(4) (D) and (E) of such Act should be commensurate with the level of development of the recipient country and sector, and shall not preclude assistance for the informal sector in such country, micro and small-scale enterprise, and smallholder agriculture.

SPECIAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 633. (a) AFGHANISTAN, IRAQ, PAKISTAN, LEBANON, MONTENEGRO, VICTIMS OF WAR, DISPLACED CHILDREN, AND DISPLACED BURMESE.—Funds appropriated by this Act that are made available for assistance for Afghanistan may be made available notwithstanding section 612 of this Act or any similar provision of law and section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and funds appropriated in titles II and III of this Act that are made available for Iraq, Lebanon, Montenegro, Pakistan, and for victims of war, displaced children, and displaced Burmese, and to assist victims of trafficking in persons and, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, to combat such trafficking, may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(b) TROPICAL FORESTRY AND BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES.—Funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106, and chapter 4 of part II, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of supporting tropical forestry and biodiversity conservation activities and energy programs aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions: *Provided*, That such assistance shall be subject to sections 116, 502B, and 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(c) PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACTORS.—Funds appropriated by this Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I, chapter 4 of part II, and section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, may be used by the United States Agency for International Development to employ up to 25 personal services contractors in the United States, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of providing direct, interim support for new or expanded overseas programs and activities managed by the agency until permanent direct hire personnel are hired and trained: *Provided*, That not more than 10 of such contractors shall be assigned to any bureau or office: *Provided further*, That such funds appropriated to carry out title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, may be made available only for personal services contractors assigned to the Office of Food for Peace.

(d)(1) WAIVER.—The President may waive the provisions of section 1003 of Public Law 100-204 if the President determines and certifies in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate that it is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) PERIOD OF APPLICATION OF WAIVER.—Any waiver pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be effective for no more than a period of 6 months at a time and shall not apply beyond 12 months after the enactment of this Act.

(e) SMALL BUSINESS.—In entering into multiple award indefinite-quantity contracts with funds appropriated by this Act, the United States Agency for International Development may provide an exception to the fair opportunity process for placing task orders under such contracts when the order is placed with any category of small or small disadvantaged business.

(f) RECONSTITUTING CIVILIAN POLICE AUTHORITY.—In providing assistance with funds appropriated by this Act under section 660(b)(6) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, support for a nation emerging from instability may be deemed to mean support for regional, district, municipal, or other sub-national entity emerging from instability, as well as a nation emerging from instability.

(g) WORLD FOOD PROGRAM.—Of the funds managed by the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance of the United States Agency for International Development, from this or any other Act, not less than \$10,000,000 shall be made available as a general contribution to the World Food Program, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(h) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) With respect to funds appropriated by this Act that are available for assistance for Pakistan, the President may waive the prohibition on assistance contained in section 608 of this Act subject to the requirements contained in section 1(b) of Public Law 107-57, as amended, for a determination and certification, and consultation, by the President prior to the exercise of such waiver authority.

(2) Section 612 of this Act and section 620(q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply with respect to assistance for Pakistan from funds appropriated by this Act.

(3) Notwithstanding the date contained in section 6 of Public Law 107-57, as amended, the provisions of sections 2 and 4 of that Act shall remain in effect through the current fiscal year.

(i) MIDDLE EAST FOUNDATION.—Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" that are available for the Middle East Partnership Initiative, may be made available, including as an endowment, notwithstanding any other provision of law and following consultations with the Committees on Appropriations, to establish and operate a Middle East Foundation, or any other similar entity, whose purposes include to support democracy, governance, human rights, and the rule of law: *Provided*, That such funds may be made available to the Foundation only to the extent that the Foundation has commitments from sources other than the United States Government to at least match the funds provided under the authority of this subsection: *Provided further*, That provisions contained in section 201 of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (excluding the authorizations of appropriations provided in subsection (b) of that section and the requirement that a majority of the members of the board of directors be citizens of the United States provided in subsection (d)(3)(B) of that section) shall be deemed to apply to any such foundation or similar entity referred to under this subsection, and to funds made available to such entity, in order to enable it to provide assistance for purposes of this section: *Provided further*, That prior to the initial obligation of funds for any such foundation or similar entity pursuant to the authorities of this subsection, other than for administrative support, the Secretary of State shall take steps to ensure, on an ongoing basis, that any such funds made available pursuant to such authorities are not provided to or through any individual or group that the management of the foundation or similar entity knows or has reason to believe, advocates, plans, sponsors, or otherwise engages in terrorist activities: *Provided further*, That section 629 of this Act shall apply to any such foundation or similar entity established pursuant to this subsection: *Provided further*, That the authority of the Foundation, or any similar entity, to

provide assistance shall cease to be effective on September 30, 2010.

(j) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—The Foreign Operations Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990 (Public Law 101-167) is amended—

(1) in section 599D (8 U.S.C. 1157 note)—

(A) in subsection(b)(3), before "2007" by striking "and", and after "2007" by inserting, "and 2008," and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking "2007" each place it appears and inserting "2008"; and

(2) in section 599E (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) in subsection (b)(2), by striking "2007" and inserting "2008".

ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

SEC. 634. It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Arab League boycott of Israel, and the secondary boycott of American firms that have commercial ties with Israel, is an impediment to peace in the region and to United States investment and trade in the Middle East and North Africa;

(2) the Arab League boycott, which was regrettably reinstated in 1997, should be immediately and publicly terminated, and the Central Office for the Boycott of Israel immediately disbanded;

(3) all Arab League states should normalize relations with their neighbor Israel;

(4) the President and the Secretary of State should continue to vigorously oppose the Arab League boycott of Israel and find concrete steps to demonstrate that opposition by, for example, taking into consideration the participation of any recipient country in the boycott when determining to sell weapons to said country; and

(5) the President should report to Congress annually on specific steps being taken by the United States to encourage Arab League states to normalize their relations with Israel to bring about the termination of the Arab League boycott of Israel, including those to encourage allies and trading partners of the United States to enact laws prohibiting businesses from complying with the boycott and penalizing businesses that do comply.

ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 635. (a) ASSISTANCE THROUGH NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Restrictions contained under titles II through V of this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapters 1, 10, 11, and 12 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and from funds appropriated under the heading "ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES": *Provided*, That before using the authority of this subsection to furnish assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations, the President shall notify the Committees on Appropriations under the regular notification procedures of those committees, including a description of the program to be assisted, the assistance to be provided, and the reasons for furnishing such assistance: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion or involuntary sterilizations contained in this or any other Act.

(b) PUBLIC LAW 480.—During fiscal year 2008, restrictions contained in this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to carry

out title I of such Act and made available pursuant to this subsection may be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply—

(1) with respect to section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to countries that support international terrorism; or

(2) with respect to section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to the government of a country that violates internationally recognized human rights.

RESERVATIONS OF FUNDS

SEC. 636. (a) Funds appropriated under titles II through V of this Act which are specifically designated may be reprogrammed for other programs within the same account notwithstanding the designation if compliance with the designation is made impossible by operation of any provision of this or any other Act: *Provided*, That any such reprogramming shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That assistance that is reprogrammed pursuant to this subsection shall be made available under the same terms and conditions as originally provided.

(b) In addition to the authority contained in subsection (a), the original period of availability of funds appropriated by this Act and administered by the United States Agency for International Development that are specifically designated for particular programs or activities by this or any other Act shall be extended for an additional fiscal year if the Administrator of such agency determines and reports promptly to the Committees on Appropriations that the termination of assistance to a country or a significant change in circumstances makes it unlikely that such designated funds can be obligated during the original period of availability: *Provided*, That such designated funds that are continued available for an additional fiscal year shall be obligated only for the purpose of such designation.

CEILINGS AND DESIGNATED FUNDING LEVELS

SEC. 637. Ceilings and specifically designated funding levels contained in this Act shall not be applicable to funds or authorities appropriated or otherwise made available by any subsequent Act unless such Act specifically so directs: *Provided*, That specifically designated funding levels or minimum funding requirements contained in any other Act shall not be applicable to funds appropriated by this Act.

PROHIBITION ON PUBLICITY OR PROPAGANDA

SEC. 638. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not authorized before the date of the enactment of this Act by the Congress: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,000 may be made available to carry out the provisions of section 316 of Public Law 96-533.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENTS TO UNITED NATIONS MEMBERS

SEC. 639. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to titles II through V of this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the United Nations or, from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the costs for participation of another country's delegation at international conferences held under the

auspices of multilateral or international organizations.

NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS—DOCUMENTATION

SEC. 640. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to titles II through V of this Act shall be available to a nongovernmental organization which fails to provide upon timely request any document, file, or record necessary to the auditing requirements of the United States Agency for International Development.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT EXPORT LETHAL MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

SEC. 641. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by titles II through V of this Act may be available to any foreign government which provides lethal military equipment to a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a terrorist government for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979. The prohibition under this section with respect to a foreign government shall terminate 12 months after that government ceases to provide such military equipment. This section applies with respect to lethal military equipment provided under a contract entered into after October 1, 1997.

(b) Assistance restricted by subsection (a) or any other similar provision of law, may be furnished if the President determines that furnishing such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States.

(c) Whenever the waiver authority of subsection (b) is exercised, the President shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees a report with respect to the furnishing of such assistance. Any such report shall include a detailed explanation of the assistance to be provided, including the estimated dollar amount of such assistance, and an explanation of how the assistance furthers United States national interests.

WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE FOR PARKING FINES AND REAL PROPERTY TAXES OWED BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

SEC. 642. (a) Subject to subsection (c), of the funds appropriated under titles II through V of this Act that are made available for assistance for a foreign country, an amount equal to 110 percent of the total amount of the unpaid fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes owed by the central government of such country shall be withheld from obligation for assistance for the central government of such country until the Secretary of State submits a certification to the appropriate congressional committees stating that such parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes are fully paid.

(b) Funds withheld from obligation pursuant to subsection (a) may be made available for other programs or activities funded by this Act, after consultation with and subject to the regular notification procedures of the appropriate congressional committees, provided that no such funds shall be made available for assistance for the central government of a foreign country that has not paid the total amount of the fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes owed by such country.

(c) Subsection (a) shall not include amounts that have been withheld under any other provision of law.

(d)(1) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to parking fines and penalties no sooner than 60 days from the date of enactment of this Act, or at any time with respect to a particular country, if the Secretary determines that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

(2) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to the unpaid property taxes if the Secretary of State determines that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

(e) Not later than six months after the initial exercise of the waiver authority in subsection (d), the Secretary of State, after consultations with the City of New York, shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing a strategy, including a timetable and steps currently being taken, to collect the parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes and interest owed by nations receiving foreign assistance under this Act.

(f) In this section:

(1) The term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term "fully adjudicated" includes circumstances in which the person to whom the vehicle is registered—

(A)(i) has not responded to the parking violation summons; or (ii) has not followed the appropriate adjudication procedure to challenge the summons; and

(B) the period of time for payment of or challenge to the summons has lapsed.

(3) The term "parking fines and penalties" means parking fines and penalties—

(A) owed to—

(i) the District of Columbia; or

(ii) New York, New York; and

(B) incurred during the period April 1, 1997, through September 30, 2007.

(4) The term "unpaid property taxes" means the amount of unpaid taxes and interest determined to be owed by a foreign country on real property in the District of Columbia or New York, New York in a court order or judgment entered against such country by a court of the United States or any State or subdivision thereof.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE PLO FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

SEC. 643. None of the funds appropriated under titles II through V of this Act may be obligated for assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) for the West Bank and Gaza unless the President has exercised the authority under section 604(a) of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995 (title VI of Public Law 104-107) or any other legislation to suspend or make inapplicable section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and that suspension is still in effect: *Provided*, That if the President fails to make the certification under section 604(b)(2) of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995 or to suspend the prohibition under other legislation, funds appropriated by this Act may not be obligated for assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization for the West Bank and Gaza.

WAR CRIMES TRIBUNALS DRAWDOWN

SEC. 644. If the President determines that doing so will contribute to a just resolution of charges regarding genocide or other violations of international humanitarian law, the President may direct a drawdown pursuant to section 552(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of up to \$30,000,000 of commodities and services for the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal established with regard to the former Yugoslavia by the United Nations Security Council or such other tribunals or commissions as the Council may establish or authorize to deal with such violations, without regard to the ceiling limitation contained in paragraph (2) thereof: *Provided*, That the determination required under this section shall be in lieu of any determinations otherwise required under section 552(c): *Provided further*, That the drawdown made under

this section for any tribunal shall not be construed as an endorsement or precedent for the establishment of any standing or permanent international criminal tribunal or court: *Provided further*, That funds made available for tribunals other than Yugoslavia, Rwanda, or the Special Court for Sierra Leone shall be made available subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

LANDMINES

SEC. 645. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, demining equipment available to the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of State and used in support of the clearance of landmines and unexploded ordnance for humanitarian purposes may be disposed of on a grant basis in foreign countries, subject to such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe.

RESTRICTIONS CONCERNING THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 646. None of the funds appropriated under titles II through V of this Act may be obligated or expended to create in any part of Jerusalem a new office of any department or agency of the United States Government for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with the Palestinian Authority over Gaza and Jericho or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to the acquisition of additional space for the existing Consulate General in Jerusalem: *Provided further*, That meetings between officers and employees of the United States and officials of the Palestinian Authority, or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles, for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with such authority should continue to take place in locations other than Jerusalem. As has been true in the past, officers and employees of the United States Government may continue to meet in Jerusalem on other subjects with Palestinians (including those who now occupy positions in the Palestinian Authority), have social contacts, and have incidental discussions.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES

SEC. 647. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under titles III or IV of this Act under the heading "INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING" or "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM" for Informational Program activities or under the headings "CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND", "DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE", and "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" may be obligated or expended to pay for—

- (1) alcoholic beverages; or
- (2) entertainment expenses for activities that are substantially of a recreational character, including but not limited to entrance fees at sporting events, theatrical and musical productions, and amusement parks.

HAITI

SEC. 648. (a) The Government of Haiti shall be eligible to purchase defense articles and services under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), for the Coast Guard.

(b) Of the funds appropriated by this act under titles III and IV, not less than \$201,584,000 shall be available for assistance for Haiti: *Provided*, That not less than the following amounts of funds appropriated by this Act under the following heading shall be made available—

- (1) \$20,000,000 from "CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND";

- (2) \$25,000,000 from "DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE";

- (3) \$83,000,000 from "GLOBAL HIV/AIDS INITIATIVE";

- (4) \$63,394,000 from "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND";

- (5) \$9,000,000 from "INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT";

- (6) \$990,000 from "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM"; and

- (7) \$200,000 from "INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING".

(c) None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading "INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT" may be used to transfer excess weapons, ammunition or other lethal property of an agency of the United States Government to the Government of Haiti for use by the Haitian National Police until the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that:

- (1) the United Nations Mission in Haiti has carried out the vetting of the senior levels of the Haitian National Police and has ensured that those credibly alleged to have committed serious crimes, including drug trafficking and human rights violations, have been suspended; and

- (2) the Haitian National Government is cooperating in a reform and restructuring plan for the Haitian National Police and the reform of the judicial system as called for in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1608 adopted on June 22, 2005.

COLOMBIA

SEC. 649. (a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE FOR COLOMBIA.—Of the funds appropriated in titles III and IV of this Act, not more than \$530,608,000 shall be available for assistance for Colombia: *Provided*, That not more than \$49,500,000 shall be available from funds appropriated by this Act under the headings "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM" and "INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING" for assistance for Colombia: *Provided further*, That not less than \$22,250,000 shall be available for rule of law activities from funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by this act under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND", not less than \$218,500,000 shall be apportioned directly to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for alternative development/institution building and sustainable development programs, of which not less than \$15,000,000 shall be made available for economic development activities in Afro-Colombian and indigenous communities, in consultation with Afro-Colombian and indigenous authorities and community members: *Provided further*, That with respect to funds apportioned to USAID under the previous proviso, the responsibility for policy decisions for the use of such funds, including what activities will be funded and the amount of funds that will be provided for each of those activities, shall be the responsibility of the Administrator of USAID in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs: *Provided further*, That with respect to funds apportioned to USAID under the third proviso of this section, not less than \$16,500,000 shall be available for judicial reform programs in Colombia; not less than \$8,250,000 shall be made available for assistance for organizations and programs to protect human rights; and not less than \$5,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for the Fiscalía: *Provided further*, That funds made available to furnish assistance to

the Government of Colombia in this Act and prior year Acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, may be used (1) to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking and terrorist organizations and activities; and (2) to take actions to protect human health and welfare in emergency circumstances, including undertaking rescue operations: *Provided further*, That the authority contained in the previous proviso shall cease to be effective if the Secretary of State has credible evidence that the Colombian Government is not conducting vigorous operations to restore government authority and respect for human rights in areas under the effective control of paramilitary, illegal self-defense groups, illegal security cooperatives, or other criminal and guerrilla organizations: *Provided further*, That the President shall ensure that if any helicopter procured with funds in this Act or prior Acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, is used to aid or abet the operations of any illegal self-defense group or illegal security cooperative, such helicopter shall be immediately returned to the United States.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 650. (a) PROHIBITION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be obligated or expended with respect to providing funds to the Palestinian Authority.

(b) WAIVER.—The prohibition included in subsection (a) shall not apply if the President certifies in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate that waiving such prohibition is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(c) PERIOD OF APPLICATION OF WAIVER.—Any waiver pursuant to subsection (b) shall be effective for no more than a period of 6 months at a time and shall not apply beyond 12 months after the enactment of this Act.

(d) REPORT.—Whenever the waiver authority pursuant to subsection (b) is exercised, the President shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations detailing the steps the Palestinian Authority has taken to arrest terrorists, confiscate weapons and dismantle the terrorist infrastructure. The report shall also include a description of how funds will be spent and the accounting procedures in place to ensure that they are properly disbursed.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO SECURITY FORCES

SEC. 651. None of the funds made available by this Act may be provided to any unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of State has credible evidence that such unit has committed gross violations of human rights, unless the Secretary determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the government of such country is taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the security forces unit to justice: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to withhold funds made available under titles II through V of this Act from any unit of the security forces of a foreign country not credibly alleged to be involved in gross violations of human rights: *Provided further*, That in the event that funds are withheld from any unit pursuant to this section, the Secretary of State shall promptly inform the foreign government of the basis for such action and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, assist the foreign government in taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the security forces to justice.

FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING REPORT

SEC. 652. The annual foreign military training report required by section 656 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be submitted by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the date specified in that section.

AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENT

SEC. 653. Funds appropriated by this Act, except funds appropriated under the headings "TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY", "OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION", and "GLOBAL HIV/AIDS INITIATIVE", may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956.

LIBYA

SEC. 654. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out any diplomatic operations in Libya or accept the credentials of any representative of the Government of Libya until such time as the President certifies to Congress that Libya has taken irrevocable steps to pay, in its entirety, the total amount of the settlement commitment of \$10,000,000 to the surviving families of each descendent of Pan Am Flight 103 and certifies to Congress that Libya will continue to work in good faith to resolve the outstanding cases of United States victims of terrorism sponsored or supported by Libya, including the settlement of the La Belle Discotheque bombing.

PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD

SEC. 655. (a) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—None of the funds appropriated under titles II through V of this Act may be provided to support a Palestinian state unless the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) a new leadership of a Palestinian governing entity has been democratically elected through credible and competitive elections;

(2) the elected governing entity of a new Palestinian state—

(A) has demonstrated a firm commitment to peaceful co-existence with the State of Israel;

(B) is taking appropriate measures to counter terrorism and terrorist financing in the West Bank and Gaza, including the dismantling of terrorist infrastructures;

(C) is establishing a new Palestinian security entity that is cooperative with appropriate Israeli and other appropriate security organizations; and

(3) the Palestinian Authority (or the governing body of a new Palestinian state) is working with other countries in the region to vigorously pursue efforts to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East that will enable Israel and an independent Palestinian state to exist within the context of full and normal relationships, which should include—

(A) termination of all claims or states of belligerency;

(B) respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every state in the area through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;

(C) their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

(D) freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area; and

(E) a framework for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the newly-elected governing

entity should enact a constitution assuring the rule of law, an independent judiciary, and respect for human rights for its citizens, and should enact other laws and regulations assuring transparent and accountable governance.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (a) if he determines that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to do so.

(d) EXEMPTION.—The restriction in subsection (a) shall not apply to assistance intended to help reform the Palestinian Authority and affiliated institutions, or a newly-elected governing entity, in order to help meet the requirements of subsection (a), consistent with the provisions of section 650 of this Act ("Limitation on Assistance to the Palestinian Authority").

LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE TO COLOMBIA

SEC. 656. (a) WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE TO THE COLOMBIAN ARMED FORCES.—

(1) REQUIREMENT TO WITHHOLD ASSISTANCE FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds appropriated by this Act under the headings "ANDEAN COUNTERDRUG INITIATIVE" and "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM" that are available for assistance for the Colombian Armed Forces—

(A) 25 percent of such funds under each such heading shall be withheld from obligation until the Secretary of State consults with, and submits a written certification to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Colombia has met the requirements described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (2); and

(B) An additional 15 percent of such funds under each such heading shall be withheld from obligation until July 31, 2008, and shall only be obligated after the Secretary of State consults with, and submits a written certification to, the Committees on Appropriations that, the Government of Colombia is continuing to meet the requirements described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (2) and has met the requirements described in subparagraphs (E) and (F) of such paragraph.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) The Commander General of the Colombian Armed Forces is suspending from the Colombian Armed Forces those members, of whatever rank, who, according to the Minister of Defense or the Procuraduría General de la Nación, have been credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights, including extra-judicial killings, or to have aided or abetted paramilitary organizations.

(B) The Government of Colombia is investigating and prosecuting, in the civilian justice system, those members of the Colombian Armed Forces, of whatever rank, who have been credibly alleged to have committed human rights violations, including extra-judicial killings, torture, or attacks against human rights defenders, or to have aided or abetted paramilitary organizations or successor armed groups, is suspending such members during the course of investigation, and is promptly punishing those members of the Colombian Armed Forces found to have committed such violations of human rights or to have aided or abetted paramilitary organizations or successor armed groups.

(C) The Colombian Armed Forces have made demonstrable efforts to cooperate fully with civilian prosecutors and judicial authorities in cases referred to in subparagraph (B) (including providing requested information, such as the identity of persons suspended from the Armed Forces and the na-

ture and cause of the suspension, and access to witnesses, relevant military documents, and other requested information).

(D) The Government of Colombia is ensuring that the Colombian Armed Forces are not violating the land and property rights of Colombia's indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities, and that the Colombian Armed Forces are appropriately distinguishing between civilians, including displaced persons, and combatants in their operations.

(E) The Colombian Armed Forces have made substantial progress in and are severing links (including denying access to military intelligence, vehicles, and other equipment or supplies, and ceasing other forms of active or tacit cooperation) at all levels, with paramilitary organizations or successor armed groups, especially in regions in which such organizations have or had a significant presence.

(F) The civilian judicial authorities of the Government of Colombia are making demonstrable progress in dismantling paramilitary leadership and financial networks by arresting and vigorously prosecuting under civilian criminal law individuals who have provided financial, planning, or logistical support, or have otherwise aided or abetted paramilitary organizations or successor armed groups, by identifying and confiscating land and other assets illegally acquired by paramilitary organizations or their associates and returning such land or assets to their rightful owners, by revoking reduced sentences for demobilized paramilitaries who engage in new criminal activity, and by arresting, prosecuting under civilian criminal law, and when requested, promptly extraditing to the United States, new, re-armed, and non-demobilized members of successor groups, especially in regions in which these networks have or had a significant presence.

(3) CERTAIN FUNDS EXEMPTED.—The requirement to withhold funds from obligation pursuant to subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to funds made available under the heading "ANDEAN COUNTERDRUG INITIATIVE" for continued support for the Critical Flight Safety Program or any alternative development programs in Colombia administered by the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State.

(4) REPORT.—At the time the Secretary of State submits the certifications required by paragraph (1)(A) and (1)(B) of this subsection, the Secretary shall also submit to the Committees on Appropriations a report that contains, with respect to each such paragraph, a detailed description of the specific actions taken by both the Colombian Government and Colombian Armed Forces which supports each requirement of the certification, and the cases or issues brought to the attention of the Secretary for which the response or action taken by the Colombian Government or Armed Forces has been inadequate.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Funds made available by this Act for the Colombian Armed Forces shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) CONSULTATIVE PROCESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until September 30, 2010, the Secretary of State shall consult with internationally recognized human rights organizations regarding progress in meeting the requirements contained in subsection (a)(2).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AIDED OR ABETTED.—The term "aided or abetted" means to provide any support to

paramilitary or successor armed groups, including taking actions which allow, facilitate, or otherwise foster the activities of such groups.

(2) **PARAMILITARY GROUPS.**—The term “paramilitary groups” means illegal self-defense groups and illegal security cooperatives, including those groups and cooperatives that have formerly demobilized but continue illegal operations, as well as parts thereof.

**PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE
PALESTINIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION**

SEC. 657. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to provide equipment, technical support, consulting services, or any other form of assistance to the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation.

**SUPPORT OF PEACE PROCESS AND
DEMobilIZATION IN COLOMBIA**

SEC. 658. (a) **ASSISTANCE FOR DEMobilIZATION AND DISARMAMENT OF FORMER IRREGULAR COMBATANTS IN COLOMBIA.**—(1) Of the funds appropriated in title III of this Act under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND”, up to \$23,000,000 shall be available for assistance for the demobilization and full dismantlement of foreign terrorist organizations in Colombia in accordance with the funding designations contained in paragraph (2) and, in the case of assistance under paragraph (2)(D), the certification requirements contained in paragraph (3).

(2) **FUNDING DESIGNATION.**—Of the funds made available pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) \$10,000,000 shall be made available to support the Justice and Peace and Human Rights Units of the Fiscalía for implementation of the Justice and Peace Law;

(B) not less than \$5,000,000 shall be made available to support the Fiscalía, Procuraduría, or Defensoría for establishment of a victims' protection program;

(C) not less than \$3,000,000 shall be made available to the Defensoría to support legal representation of victims as required by the Justice and Peace Law; and

(D) up to \$5,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for the demobilization, disarmament, and reintegration of former members of foreign terrorist organizations (FTOs) in Colombia, specifically the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) and the National Liberation Army (ELN), if the Secretary of State submits a certification described in paragraph (3) to the Committees on Appropriations prior to the initial obligation of amounts for such assistance.

(3) **CERTIFICATION.**—The certification required by paragraph (2)(D) is a certification that—

(A) assistance for the fiscal year will be provided only for individuals who:

(i) have verifiably renounced and terminated any affiliation or involvement with FTOs or other illegal armed groups;

(ii) are meeting all the requirements of the Colombia Demobilization Program, including having fully and truthfully disclosed their involvement in past crimes and their knowledge of the foreign terrorist organizations structure, financing sources, illegal assets, and the location of kidnapping victims and bodies of the disappeared; and

(iii) are not involved in threatening or intimidating human rights defenders.

(B) the Government of Colombia is providing full cooperation to the Government of the United States to extradite the leaders and members of the FTOs who have been indicted in the United States for murder, kidnapping, narcotics trafficking, and other violations of United States law, and is immediately extraditing to the United States

those commanders, leaders and members indicted in the United States who are credibly alleged to have breached the terms of the Colombia Demobilization Program, including by failing to fully confess their crimes, failing to disclose their assets, or committing new crimes since the approval of the Justice and Peace Law;

(C) the Government of Colombia is not taking any steps to legalize the titles of land or other assets illegally obtained and held by FTOs, their associates, or successors, has established effective procedures to identify such land and assets, and is vigorously confiscating and returning such land and other assets to their rightful owners; and the Government of Colombia's reintegration programs exclude any projects that would leave illegally obtained land or assets in the possession of FTO members, their associates, or successors;

(D) members of FTOs who receive sentence reductions under the Colombian Justice and Peace Law are serving their sentences in maximum-security penitentiary establishments, under conditions of detention that are appropriate to deter and effectively prevent them from continuing to engage in criminal activity;

(E) the Government of Colombia is implementing a concrete and workable framework for dismantling the organizational structures of foreign terrorist organizations;

(F) funds are not made available as cash payments to individuals and are available only for activities relating to demobilization, disarmament, reintegration (including training and education), and vetting; and

(G) the Government of Colombia is promptly, impartially, and thoroughly investigating all attacks against human rights defenders allegedly committed by FTOs or other illegal armed groups.

(4) **REPORT.**—The report accompanying the certification required by paragraph (3) shall specify, with respect to each condition described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of paragraph (3)—

(A) the action taken by the Colombian Government which supports the certification;

(B) the cases or issues brought to the attention of the Secretary for which the response or action taken by the Colombian Government has been inadequate; and

(C) the views of the Colombian Attorney General and the Inspector General with respect to the Colombian Government's actions in relation to the conditions described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of paragraph (3).

(5) **CONSULTATIVE PROCESS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter until September 30, 2010, the Secretary of State shall consult with internationally recognized human rights and justice organizations, including organizations representing internally displaced persons, and representatives of victims of demobilized FTOs, regarding progress in meeting the conditions contained in paragraph (3).

(6) **FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION DEFINED.**—In this subsection the term “foreign terrorist organization” means an organization designated as a terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(7) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Funds made available in title III of this Act for demobilization/reintegration of former members of FTOs in Colombia shall be subject to prior consultation with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations.

(b) **ASSISTANCE TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (OAS) MISSION TO SUPPORT THE PEACE PROCESS IN COLOMBIA.**—Of the

funds appropriated by this Act under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND”, not less than \$3,000,000 shall be made available to support the peace process in Colombia, as follows:

(1) not less than \$2,700,000 shall be made available to the OAS Mission to Support the Peace Process in Colombia to assist the mission to fulfill its mandate of independent international verification of the paramilitary demobilization process; and

(2) not less than \$300,000 may be made available to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to conduct monitoring of the demobilization process.

WEST BANK AND GAZA PROGRAM

SEC. 659. (a) **OVERSIGHT.**—For fiscal year 2008, 30 days prior to the initial obligation of funds for the bilateral West Bank and Gaza Program, the Secretary of State shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations that procedures have been established to assure the Comptroller General of the United States will have access to appropriate United States financial information in order to review the uses of United States assistance for the Program funded under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND” for the West Bank and Gaza.

(b) **VETTING.**—Prior to the obligation of funds appropriated by this Act under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND” for assistance for the West Bank and Gaza, the Secretary of State shall take all appropriate steps to ensure that such assistance is not provided to or through any individual, private or government entity, or educational institution that the Secretary knows or has reason to believe advocates, plans, sponsors, engages in, or has engaged in, terrorist activity nor those that have as a trustee any member of a certified foreign terrorist organization. The Secretary of State shall, as appropriate, establish procedures specifying the steps to be taken in carrying out this subsection and shall terminate assistance to any individual, entity, or educational institution which she has determined to be involved in or advocating terrorist activity.

(c) **PROHIBITION.**—

(1) None of the funds appropriated under titles II through V of this Act for assistance under the West Bank and Gaza program may be made available for the purpose of recognizing or otherwise honoring individuals who commit, or have committed acts of terrorism.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available by this or prior appropriations act, including funds made available by transfer, may be made available for obligation for security assistance for the West Bank and Gaza until the Secretary of State reports to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on the benchmarks that have been established for security assistance for the West Bank and Gaza and reports on the extent of Palestinian compliance with such benchmarks.

(d) **AUDITS.**—

(1) The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall ensure that Federal or non-Federal audits of all contractors and grantees, and significant subcontractors and sub-grantees, under the West Bank and Gaza Program, are conducted at least on an annual basis to ensure, among other things, compliance with this section.

(2) Of the funds appropriated by this Act up to \$1,000,000 may be used by the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development for audits, inspections, and other activities in furtherance of the requirements of this subsection.

(e) Subsequent to the certification specified in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an

audit and an investigation of the treatment, handling, and uses of all funds for the bilateral West Bank and Gaza Program in fiscal year 2008 under the heading "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND". The audit shall address—

(1) the extent to which such Program complies with the requirements of subsections (b) and (c), and

(2) an examination of all programs, projects, and activities carried out under such Program, including both obligations and expenditures.

(f) Not later than 180 days after enactment of this act, the secretary of state shall submit a report to the committees on appropriations updating the report contained in section 2106 of chapter 2 of title II of Public Law 109-13.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND

SEC. 660. (a) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTION.—Of the amounts made available under "International Organizations and Programs" and "Child Survival and Health Programs Fund" accounts for fiscal year 2008, \$40,000,000 shall be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA): *Provided*, That of this amount, not less than \$23,000,000 shall be derived from funds appropriated under the heading "International Organizations and Programs".

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated under the heading "INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS" in this Act that are available for UNFPA, that are not made available for UNFPA because of the operation of any provision of law, shall be transferred to the "CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND" account and shall be made available for family planning, maternal, and reproductive health activities, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CHINA.—None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by UNFPA for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(d) CONDITIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under this Act for UNFPA may not be made available to UNFPA unless—

(1) UNFPA maintains amounts made available to UNFPA under this section in an account separate from other accounts of UNFPA;

(2) UNFPA does not commingle amounts made available to UNFPA under this section with other sums; and

(3) UNFPA does not fund abortions.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS AND DOLLAR-FOR-DOLLAR WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.—

(1) Not later than four months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate Congressional committees indicating the amount of funds that the UNFPA is budgeting for the year in which the report is submitted for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(2) If a report under subparagraph (d) indicates that the UNFPA plans to spend funds for a country program in the People's Republic of China in the year covered by the report, then the amount of such funds that the UNFPA plans to spend in the People's Republic of China shall be deducted from the funds made available to the UNFPA after March 1 for obligation for the remainder of the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President to deny funds to any organization by reason of the application of another provision of this Act or any other provision of law.

WAR CRIMINALS

SEC. 661. (a)(1) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under titles II through V of this Act may be made available for assistance, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to vote against any new project involving the extension by such institutions of any financial or technical assistance, to any country, entity, or municipality whose competent authorities have failed, as determined by the Secretary of State, to take necessary and significant steps to implement its international legal obligations to apprehend and transfer to the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (the "Tribunal") all persons in their territory who have been indicted by the Tribunal and to otherwise cooperate with the Tribunal.

(2) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to humanitarian assistance or assistance for democratization.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply unless the Secretary of State determines and reports to the appropriate Congressional committees that the competent authorities of such country, entity, or municipality are—

(1) cooperating with the Tribunal, including access for investigators to archives and witnesses, the provision of documents, and the surrender and transfer of indictees or assistance in their apprehension; and

(2) are acting consistently with the Dayton Accords.

(c) Not less than ten days before any vote in an international financial institution regarding the extension of any new project involving financial or technical assistance or grants to any country or entity described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations a written justification for the proposed assistance, including an explanation of the United States position regarding any such vote, as well as a description of the location of the proposed assistance by municipality, its purpose, and its intended beneficiaries.

(d) In carrying out this section, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with representatives of human rights organizations and all government agencies with relevant information to help prevent indicted war criminals from benefiting from any financial or technical assistance or grants provided to any country or entity described in subsection (a).

(e) The Secretary of State may waive the application of subsection (a) with respect to projects within a country, entity, or municipality upon a written determination to the Committees on Appropriations that such assistance directly supports the implementation of the Dayton Accords.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) COUNTRY.—The term "country" means Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia.

(2) ENTITY.—The term "entity" refers to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska.

(3) MUNICIPALITY.—The term "municipality" means a city, town or other subdivision within a country or entity as defined herein.

(4) DAYTON ACCORDS.—The term "Dayton Accords" means the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, together with annexes relating thereto, done at Dayton, November 10 through 16, 1995.

USER FEES

SEC. 662. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act) and the International Monetary Fund to oppose any loan, grant, strategy or policy of these institutions that would require user fees or service charges on poor people for primary education or primary healthcare, including prevention, treatment and care efforts for HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and infant, child, and maternal well-being, in connection with the institutions' financing programs.

FUNDING FOR SERBIA

SEC. 663. (a) Funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the central Government of Serbia and the Government of Montenegro after May 31, 2008, if the President has made the determination and certification contained in subsection (c).

(b) After May 31, 2008, the Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to support loans and assistance to the Government of Serbia and Government of Montenegro subject to the conditions in subsection (c): *Provided*, That section 576 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, as amended, shall not apply to the provision of loans and assistance to the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro through international financial institutions.

(c) The determination and certification referred to in subsection (a) is a determination by the President and a certification to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Serbia and the Government of Montenegro is—

(1) cooperating with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia including access for investigators, the provision of documents, timely information on the location, travel, and sources of financial support of indictees, and the surrender and transfer of indictees or assistance in their apprehension, including Ratko Mladic;

(2) taking steps that are consistent with the Dayton Accords to end Serbian financial, political, security and other support which has served to maintain separate Republika Srpska institutions; and

(3) taking steps to implement policies which reflect a respect for minority rights and the rule of law.

(d) This section shall not apply to Kosovo and Montenegro, humanitarian assistance or assistance to promote democracy.

COMMUNITY-BASED POLICE ASSISTANCE

SEC. 664. (a) AUTHORITY.—Funds made available by title III of this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used, notwithstanding section 660 of that Act, to enhance the effectiveness and accountability of civilian police authority through training and technical assistance in human rights, the rule of law, strategic planning, and through assistance to foster civilian police roles that support democratic governance including assistance for programs to prevent conflict, respond to disasters, address gender-based violence, and foster improved police relations with the communities they serve.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be subject to prior consultation with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations.

SPECIAL DEBT RELIEF FOR THE POOREST

SEC. 665. (a) AUTHORITY TO REDUCE DEBT.—The President may reduce amounts owed to

the United States (or any agency of the United States) by an eligible country as a result of—

- (1) guarantees issued under sections 221 and 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;
- (2) credits extended or guarantees issued under the Arms Export Control Act; or
- (3) any obligation or portion of such obligation, to pay for purchases of United States agricultural commodities guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under export credit guarantee programs authorized pursuant to section 5(f) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of June 29, 1948, as amended, section 4(b) of the Food for Peace Act of 1966, as amended (Public Law 89-808), or section 202 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended (Public Law 95-501).

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only to implement multilateral official debt relief and referendum agreements, commonly referred to as “Paris Club Agreed Minutes”.

(2) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only in such amounts or to such extent as is provided in advance by appropriations Acts.

(3) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to countries with heavy debt burdens that are eligible to borrow from the International Development Association, but not from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, commonly referred to as “IDA-only” countries.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to a country whose government—

- (1) does not have an excessive level of military expenditures;
- (2) has not repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism;
- (3) is not failing to cooperate on international narcotics control matters;
- (4) does not engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights (including its military or other security forces); and
- (5) is not ineligible for assistance because of the application of section 527 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading “DEBT RESTRUCTURING”.

(e) CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS INAPPLICABLE.—A reduction of debt pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be considered assistance for the purposes of any provision of law limiting assistance to a country. The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised notwithstanding section 620(r) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or section 321 of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975.

AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN DEBT BUYBACKS OR SALES

SEC. 666. (a) LOANS ELIGIBLE FOR SALE, REDUCTION, OR CANCELLATION.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO SELL, REDUCE, OR CANCEL CERTAIN LOANS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may, in accordance with this section, sell to any eligible purchaser any concessional loan or portion thereof made before January 1, 1995, pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to the government of any eligible country as defined in section 702(6) of that Act or on receipt of payment from an eligible purchaser, reduce or cancel such loan or portion thereof, only for the purpose of facilitating—

(A) debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps; or

(B) a debt buyback by an eligible country of its own qualified debt, only if the eligible

country uses an additional amount of the local currency of the eligible country, equal to not less than 40 percent of the price paid for such debt by such eligible country, or the difference between the price paid for such debt and the face value of such debt, to support activities that link conservation and sustainable use of natural resources with local community development, and child survival and other child development, in a manner consistent with sections 707 through 710 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, if the sale, reduction, or cancellation would not contravene any term or condition of any prior agreement relating to such loan.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall, in accordance with this section, establish the terms and conditions under which loans may be sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section.

(3) ADMINISTRATION.—The Facility, as defined in section 702(8) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall notify the administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of purchasers that the President has determined to be eligible, and shall direct such agency to carry out the sale, reduction, or cancellation of a loan pursuant to this section. Such agency shall make adjustment in its accounts to reflect the sale, reduction, or cancellation.

(4) LIMITATION.—The authorities of this subsection shall be available only to the extent that appropriations for the cost of the modification, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, are made in advance.

(b) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—The proceeds from the sale, reduction, or cancellation of any loan sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the United States Government account or accounts established for the repayment of such loan.

(c) ELIGIBLE PURCHASERS.—A loan may be sold pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A) only to a purchaser who presents plans satisfactory to the President for using the loan for the purpose of engaging in debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(d) DEBTOR CONSULTATIONS.—Before the sale to any eligible purchaser, or any reduction or cancellation pursuant to this section, of any loan made to an eligible country, the President should consult with the country concerning the amount of loans to be sold, reduced, or canceled and their uses for debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to funds appropriated by this Act under the heading “DEBT RESTRUCTURING”.

BASIC EDUCATION

SEC. 667. Of the funds appropriated by title III of this Act, not less than \$750,000,000 shall be made available for assistance for developing countries for basic education. Of this amount, not less than \$265,000,000 shall be provided and implemented in countries that have an approved national education plan.

(a) COORDINATOR.—There shall be established within the Department of State in the immediate office of the Secretary of State, a Coordinator of United States Government activities to provide basic education assistance in developing countries (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Coordinator”).

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—That this Coordinator shall have primary responsibility for the oversight and coordination of all resources and international activities of the

United States Government that provide assistance in developing countries for basic education. The individual serving as the Coordinator may not hold any other position in the Federal Government during the individual's time of service as Coordinator.

(c) STRATEGY.—The President shall develop a comprehensive integrated United States Government strategy to provide assistance in developing countries for basic education within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30, 2008, the Secretary of State shall report to the Committees on Appropriations on the implementation of United States Government assistance programs in developing countries for basic education.

(e) Funds appropriated by title II of Public Law 109-102 and provided to the Comptroller General pursuant to section 567 of that Act shall be available until expended and are also available to the Comptroller General to conduct further evaluations of basic education programs in developing countries under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations.

RECONCILIATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 668. Of the funds appropriated by title III of this Act under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND”, not less than \$12,000,000 shall be made available to support Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation Programs and an additional amount of \$11,000,000 shall be made available to support Middle East People to People Coexistence Programs to promote activities which bring together individuals of different ethnic, religious, and political backgrounds from areas of civil conflict and war.

SUDAN

SEC. 669. (a) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—Subject to subsection (d):

(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the Government of Sudan.

(2) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the cost, as defined in section 502, of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying loans and loan guarantees held by the Government of Sudan, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts owed to the United States, and modifying concessional loans, guarantees, and credit agreements.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that—

(1) The Government of Sudan honors its pledges to cease attacks upon civilians and disarms and demobilizes the Janjaweed and other government-supported militias;

(2) The Government of Sudan and all government-supported militia groups are honoring their commitments made in all previous cease-fire agreements;

(3) The Government of Sudan is allowing unimpeded access to Darfur to humanitarian aid organizations, the human rights investigation and humanitarian teams of the United Nations, including protection officers, and the international monitoring team that is based in Darfur and has the support of the United States;

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of subsection (b) shall not apply to—

(1) humanitarian assistance;

(2) assistance for the Darfur region, Southern Sudan, Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State, and Abyei; and

(3) assistance to support implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the Darfur Peace Agreement or any other internationally-recognized viable peace agreement in Sudan.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this Act, the term “Government of Sudan”, shall

not include the Government of Southern Sudan.

(e) Notwithstanding any other law, assistance in this Act may be made available to the Government of Southern Sudan to provide non-lethal military assistance, military education and training, and defense services controlled under the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (22 CFR 120.1 et seq.) if the Secretary of State—

(1) determines that the provision of such items is in the national interest of the United States; and

(2) not later than 15 days before the provision of any such assistance, notifies the Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives of such determination.

TRADE CAPACITY BUILDING

SEC. 670. Of the funds appropriated by this Act, under the headings “DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE”, “ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES”, “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND”, “ANDEAN COUNTERDRUG INITIATIVE”, and “ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION”, not less than \$525,000,000 should be made available for trade capacity building assistance: *Provided*, That \$10,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND” shall be made available for labor and environmental capacity building activities relating to the free trade agreement with the countries of Central America and the Dominican Republic.

EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR CENTRAL AND SOUTH EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES

SEC. 671. Notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)), during fiscal year 2008, funds available to the Department of Defense may be expended for crating, packing, handling, and transportation of excess defense articles transferred under the authority of section 516 of such Act to Albania, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia, Georgia, India, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Mongolia, Pakistan, Romania, Slovakia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Ukraine.

ASSISTANCE TO COLOMBIA LAW ENFORCEMENT TO COMBAT ILLEGAL ARMED GROUPS

SEC. 672. (a) ASSISTANCE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES.—

(1) WITHHOLDING OBLIGATIONS OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of State shall withhold the obligation of funds for assistance to any Colombian law enforcement or intelligence agency, including the Colombian National Police, the Fiscalía, and the Departamento Administrativo de Seguridad (the Intelligence Service), if the Secretary determines that—

(A) there has been significant infiltration of the agency by the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), or the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), successor groups, or criminal organizations; or

(B) the agency's leadership has willfully provided any support to such groups, including taking actions or failing to take actions which allow, facilitate, or otherwise foster the activities of such groups.

(2) RESUMPTION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State may resume the obligation of funds suspended under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations, based on a careful review of the structure and member-

ship of the agency involved, that it has credibly and effectively eliminated the penetration of individuals associated with illegal armed groups, and removed those leaders and members who were providing support to such groups.

(b) ILLEGAL ARMED GROUPS.—

(1) DENIAL OF VISAS TO SUPPORTERS OF COLOMBIAN ILLEGAL ARMED GROUPS.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of State shall not issue a visa to any alien who the Secretary determines, based on credible evidence—

(A) has willfully provided any support to the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), or the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), or successor groups, including taking actions or failing to take actions which allow, facilitate, or otherwise foster the activities of such groups; or

(B) has committed, ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the commission of gross violations of human rights, including extra-judicial killings, in Colombia.

(2) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply if the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations, on a case-by-case basis, that the issuance of a visa to the alien is necessary to support the peace process in Colombia or for urgent humanitarian reasons.

CUBA

SEC. 673. None of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading “INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT” may be made available for assistance to the Government of Cuba.

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

SEC. 674. Programs funded under titles III and IV of this Act that provide training for foreign police, judicial, and military officials, shall include, where appropriate, programs and activities that address gender-based violence.

LIMITATION ON ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT ARE PARTIES TO THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

SEC. 675. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND” may be used to provide assistance to the government of a country that is a party to the International Criminal Court and has not entered into an agreement with the United States pursuant to Article 98 of the Rome Statute preventing the International Criminal Court from proceeding against United States personnel present in such country.

(b) The President may, with prior notice to Congress, waive the prohibition of subsection (a) with respect to a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (“NATO”) member country, a major non-NATO ally (including Australia, Egypt, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Argentina, the Republic of Korea, and New Zealand), Taiwan, or such other country as he may determine if he determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is important to the national interests of the United States to waive such prohibition.

(c) The President may, with prior notice to Congress, waive the prohibition of subsection (a) with respect to a particular country if he determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that such country has entered into an agreement with the United States pursuant to Article 98 of the Rome Statute preventing the International Criminal Court from proceeding against United States personnel present in such country.

(d) The prohibition of this section shall not apply to countries otherwise eligible for as-

sistance under the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003, notwithstanding section 606(a)(2)(B) of such Act.

TIBET

SEC. 676. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution to use the voice and vote of the United States to support projects in Tibet if such projects do not provide incentives for the migration and settlement of non-Tibetans into Tibet or facilitate the transfer of ownership of Tibetan land and natural resources to non-Tibetans; are based on a thorough needs-assessment; foster self-sufficiency of the Tibetan people and respect Tibetan culture and traditions; and are subject to effective monitoring.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not less than \$5,000,000 of the funds appropriated by title III of this Act under the heading “ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND” should be made available to nongovernmental organizations to support activities which preserve cultural traditions and promote sustainable development and environmental conservation in Tibetan communities in the Tibetan Autonomous Region and in other Tibetan communities in China, and not less than \$250,000 should be made available to the National Endowment for Democracy for human rights and democracy programs relating to Tibet.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

SEC. 677. (a) Not less than the amounts of funds initially allocated for the fiscal year 2007 pursuant to section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Honduras under the headings “CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND” and “DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE”, should be made available for each such country from funds appropriated under such headings by this Act.

(b) Not less than the aggregate amount of funds initially allocated for the fiscal year 2007 pursuant to section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for countries in the Western Hemisphere under the heading “FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM”, should be made available for such countries from funds appropriated under such heading by this Act: *Provided*, That not less than the following amounts from funds appropriated by this Act under such heading shall be made available to enhance security in the Western Hemisphere consistent with democratic principles and the rule of law—

- (1) \$48,000,000 for assistance for Colombia;
- (2) \$4,800,000 for assistance for El Salvador;
- (3) \$500,000 for assistance for Honduras;
- (4) \$300,000 for assistance for Bolivia;
- (5) \$250,000 for assistance for Guatemala; and
- (6) \$100,000 for assistance for Belize.

(c) Funds made available pursuant to subsection (b) shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 678. (a) AUTHORITY.—Up to \$81,000,000 of the funds made available in title III of this Act to carry out the provisions of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading “ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES”, may be used by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to hire and employ individuals in the United States and overseas on a limited appointment basis pursuant to the authority of sections 308 and 309 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) The number of individuals hired in any fiscal year pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) may not exceed 175.

(2) The authority to hire individuals contained in subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2009.

(c) **CONDITIONS.**—The authority of subsection (a) may only be used to the extent that an equivalent number of positions that are filled by personal services contractors or other non-direct hire employees of USAID, who are compensated with funds appropriated to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading “ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES”, are eliminated.

(d) **PRIORITY SECTORS.**—In exercising the authority of this section, primary emphasis shall be placed on enabling USAID to meet personnel positions in technical skill areas currently encumbered by contractor or other non-direct hire personnel.

(e) **CONSULTATIONS.**—The USAID Administrator shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations at least on a quarterly basis concerning the implementation of this section.

(f) **PROGRAM ACCOUNT CHARGED.**—The account charged for the cost of an individual hired and employed under the authority of this section shall be the account to which such individual's responsibilities primarily relate. Funds made available to carry out this section may be transferred to and merged and consolidated with funds appropriated for “OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT”.

(g) **MANAGEMENT REFORM PILOT.**—Of the funds made available in subsection (a), USAID may use, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, up to \$10,000,000 to fund overseas support costs of members of the Foreign Service with a Foreign Service rank of four or below: *Provided*, That such authority is only used to reduce USAID's reliance on overseas personal services contractors or other non-direct hire employees compensated with funds appropriated to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading “ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES”.

(h) **DISASTER SURGE CAPACITY.**—Funds appropriated under title III of this Act to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading “ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES”, may be used, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the cost (including the support costs) of individuals detailed to or employed by the United States Agency for International Development whose primary responsibility is to carry out programs in response to natural disasters.

OPIC TRANSFER AUTHORITY (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 679. Whenever the President determines that it is in furtherance of the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, up to a total of \$20,000,000 of the funds appropriated under title III of this Act may be transferred to and merged with funds appropriated by this Act for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Program Account, to be subject to the terms and conditions of that account: *Provided*, That such funds shall not be available for administrative expenses of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation: *Provided further*, That designated funding levels in this Act shall not be transferred pursuant to this section: *Provided further*, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT

SEC. 680. The Secretary of State shall provide the Committees on Appropriations, not later than April 1, 2008, and for each fiscal quarter, a report in writing on the uses of funds made available under the headings “FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM”, “INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING”, and “PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS”: *Provided*, That such report shall include a description of the obligation and expenditure of funds, and the specific country in receipt of, and the use or purpose of the assistance provided by such funds.

ANTICORRUPTION PROVISIONS

SEC. 681. Twenty percent of the funds appropriated under title V of this Act under the heading “INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE”, shall be withheld from disbursement until the Secretary of the Treasury reports to the appropriate Congressional committees on the extent to which the World Bank has completed the following:

(1) World Bank procurement guidelines have been applied to all procurement financed in whole or in part by a loan from the World Bank or a credit agreement or grant from the International Development Association (IDA).

(2) The World Bank proposal “Increasing the Use of Country Systems in Procurement” dated March 2005 has been withdrawn.

(3) The World Bank maintains a strong central procurement office staffed with senior experts who are designated to address commercial concerns, questions, and complaints regarding procurement procedures and payments under IDA and World Bank projects.

(4) Thresholds for international competitive bidding have been established to maximize international competitive bidding in accordance with sound procurement practices, including transparency, competition, and cost-effective results for the Borrowers.

(5) All tenders under the World Bank's national competitive bidding provisions are subject to the same advertisement requirements as tenders under international competitive bidding.

(6) Loan agreements between the World Bank and the Borrowers have been made public.

INDONESIA

SEC. 682. Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading “FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM”, not more than \$6,000,000 may be made available for assistance for Indonesia, until the Secretary of State reports to the Committees on Appropriations on steps taken by the Government of Indonesia on the following—

(1) prosecution and punishment, in a manner proportional to the crime, for members of the Armed Forces who have been credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights;

(2) cooperation by the Armed Forces, at the direction of the President of Indonesia, with civilian judicial authorities and with international efforts to resolve cases of gross violations of human rights in East Timor and elsewhere; and

(3) implementation by the Armed Forces, at the direction of the President of Indonesia, of reforms to increase the transparency and accountability of their operations and financial management.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GROWTH FUND

SEC. 683. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GROWTH FUND.—

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State, acting through the Director of United States Foreign Assistance, shall establish the Glob-

al Resources and Opportunities for Women to Thrive (GROWTH) Fund for the purpose of enhancing economic opportunities for very poor, poor, and low-income women in developing countries with a focus on—

(A) increasing women-owned enterprise development;

(B) increasing property rights for women;

(C) increasing women's access to financial services;

(D) increasing women in leadership in implementing organizations, such as indigenous nongovernmental organizations, community-based organizations, and regulated financial intermediaries;

(E) improving women's employment benefits and conditions; and

(F) increasing women's ability to benefit from global trade.

(2) **ROLE OF USAID MISSIONS.**—The Fund shall be available to USAID missions to apply for additional funding to support specific additional activities that enhance women's economic opportunities or to integrate gender into existing economic opportunity programs.

(b) **ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.**—The Fund shall be available to USAID missions to support—

(1) initiatives to eliminate legal and institutional barriers to women's ownership of assets, access to credit, access to information and communication technologies, and engagement in business activities within or outside of the home;

(2) microfinance and microenterprise development programs that—

(A) specifically target women with respect to outreach and marketing; and

(B) provide products specifically to address women's assets, needs, and the barriers women encounter with respect to participation in enterprise and financial services;

(3) programs, projects, and activities for enterprise development for women in developing countries that—

(A) in coordination with developing country governments and interested individuals and organizations, encourage or enhance laws, regulations, enforcement, and other practices that promote access to banking and financial services for women-owned small- and medium-sized enterprises, and eliminate or reduce regulatory barriers that may exist in this regard;

(B) promote access to information and communication technologies (ICT) with training in ICT for women-owned small- and medium-sized enterprises;

(C) provide training, through local associations of women-owned enterprises or nongovernmental organizations in record keeping, financial and personnel management, international trade, business planning, marketing, policy advocacy, leadership development, and other relevant areas;

(D) provide resources to establish and enhance local, national, and international networks and associations of women-owned small- and medium-sized enterprises;

(E) provide incentives for nongovernmental organizations and regulated financial intermediaries to develop products, services, and marketing and outreach strategies specifically designed to facilitate and promote women's participation in small- and medium-sized business development programs by addressing women's assets, needs, and the barriers they face to participation in enterprise and financial services; and

(F) seek to award contracts to qualified indigenous women-owned small- and medium-sized enterprises, including for post-conflict reconstruction and to facilitate employment of indigenous women, including during post-conflict reconstruction in jobs not traditionally undertaken by women;

(4) programs, projects, and activities for the promotion of private property rights and

land tenure security for women in developing countries that are implemented by local, indigenous nongovernmental and community-based organizations dedicated to addressing the needs of women, especially women's organizations that—

(A) advocate to amend and harmonize statutory and customary law to give women equal rights to own, use, and inherit property;

(B) promote legal literacy among women and men about property rights for women and how to exercise such rights;

(C) assist women in making land claims and protecting women's existing claims; and

(D) advocate for equitable land titling and registration for women;

(5) activities to increase women's access to employment and to higher quality employment with better remuneration and working conditions in developing countries, including access to insurance and other social safety nets, in informal and formal employment relative to core labor standards determined by the International Labor Organization. Such activities should include—

(A) public education efforts to inform poor women and men of their legal rights related to employment;

(B) education and vocational training tailored to enable poor women to access opportunities in potential growth sectors in their local economies and in jobs within the formal and informal sectors where women are not traditionally highly represented;

(C) efforts to support self-employed poor women or wage workers to form or join independent unions or other labor associations to increase their income and improve their working conditions; and

(D) advocacy efforts to protect the rights of women in the workplace, including—

(i) developing programs with the participation of civil society to eliminate gender-based violence; and

(ii) providing capacity-building assistance to women's organizations to effectively research and monitor labor rights conditions;

(6) assistance to governments and organizations in developing countries seeking to design and implement laws, regulations, and programs to improve working conditions for women and to facilitate their entry into and advancement in the workplace;

(7) training and education to women in civil society, including those organizations representing poor women, and to women-owned enterprises and associations of such enterprises, on how to respond to economic opportunities created by trade preference programs, trade agreements, or other policies creating market access, including training on United States market access requirements and procedures;

(8) capacity-building for women entrepreneurs, including microentrepreneurs, on production strategies, quality standards, formation of cooperatives, market research, and market development;

(9) capacity-building to women, including poor women, to promote diversification of products and value-added processing;

(10) training to official government negotiators representing developing countries in order to enhance the ability of such negotiators to formulate trade policy and negotiate agreements that take into account the respective needs and priorities of a country's poor women and men;

(11) training to local, indigenous women's groups in developing countries in order to enhance their ability to collect information and data, formulate proposals, and inform and impact official government negotiators representing their country in international trade negotiations of the respective needs and priorities of a country's poor women and men; and

(12) technical assistance and capacity-building to local, indigenous civil society for—

(A) local indigenous women's organizations to the maximum extent practicable; and

(B) nongovernmental organizations and regulated financial intermediaries that demonstrate a commitment to gender equity in their leadership either through current practice or through specific programs to increase the representation of women in their governance and management.

PEACEKEEPING CAP

SEC. 684. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404(b)(2)(B) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, (22 U.S.C. 287e note) is amended at the end by adding the following: “(v) For assessments made during calendar year 2008, 27.1 percent.”.

LIMITATION ON BASING IN IRAQ

SEC. 685. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Government of the United States to enter into a basing rights agreement between the United States and Iraq.

Mrs. LOWEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 190, line 26, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:

Page 190, line 25, insert “permanent” before “basing rights agreement”.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment that I bring to the floor of the House under limitation on bases in Iraq is an amendment that addresses the subject matter that we have debated on the floor at least twice before that I recall. And I believe there is a consensus here in this Congress, and certainly there has been a message that has been put forth by the President, that we are not interested in permanent bases in Iraq but we do have bases there and we do have temporary basing agreements.

So as I read through this appropriations bill and it says that “None of the funds made available in this act may be used by the Government of the United States to enter into a basing rights agreement between the United States and Iraq,” that language clearly forbids any agreements, however temporary they might be. And so the amendment that I bring to the floor simply adds the word “permanent” to that language. So that now, if the

amendment is adopted, it will read that none of the funds may be used to enter into a “permanent” basing rights agreement.

I think it is a matter of language and semantics here but a matter of clarity, too. And I would point out that in our last debate in the 2007 DOD appropriations, Mr. MURTHA made the statement, what we are saying with this bill is that at this point in time there shouldn't be any permanent bases in Iraq. What I have done is offer an amendment that simply says there won't be any of the funds used to promote permanent bases in Iraq out of this Foreign Ops bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment. And I want to be clear to my colleague from Iowa we all agree that the United States should not be an occupying power in Iraq, but in no way does my acceptance of this amendment come to my or the American people's acquiescence to establishing any other kind of short- or long-term basing agreements in Iraq. But we are accepting the amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would say that we may not have the same view on how to proceed in Iraq, but it is my intention to foreclose any permanent bases in Iraq and allow those that are under agreement now and perhaps temporary ones that might be negotiated to get us through this process. I think that is the intent on both sides of the aisle. I think that is the intent of the White House. So I believe we are consistent in our understanding.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentleman. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, while I understand that the Chairwoman is prepared to accept it, this amendment causes me great concern.

Given Mr. KING's history in opposition to the underlying provision, I believe that this amendment is nothing more than a backdoor attempt to leaving U.S. troops in Iraq long-term.

The bottom line is, Mr. Chairman, when our troops come home, they should all come home.

And three times, twice in 2006 and once this year Congress passed—and the President signed into law—legislation prohibiting permanent military bases in Iraq.

The prospect of having long-term military bases would send the wrong message to our troops, the Iraqi people, and the world.

The prospect of an indefinite occupation fuels the insurgency by serving as a recruiting tool for insurgents and places targets on the backs of our troops.

The Iraq Study Group has recognized the importance of unequivocally declaring that we have no intention of remaining in Iraq permanently.

Key administration officials, including Secretary Gates have pronounced that we are not

going to establish permanent military bases in Iraq.

Even President Bush has declared that we 'do not support an indefinite occupation' in Iraq.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I wish this were a genuine attempt to prohibit an indefinite occupation in Iraq.

I'm concerned that it is not.

PROHIBITION ON USE OF TORTURE

SEC. 686. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used in any way whatsoever to support or justify the use of torture by any official or contract employee of the United States Government.

REPORT ON INDONESIAN COOPERATION

SEC. 687. Funds available under the heading "INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING" may only be made available for assistance for Indonesia if the Secretary of State submits a report to the Committees on Appropriations that describes—

(1) Steps taken by the Indonesian government to deny promotion to and to remove from service military officers indicted for serious crimes; the extent to which the Indonesian Government is cooperating with international efforts to bring current and past officials to justice; and that past and present Indonesian military officials are cooperating with domestic inquiries into past abuses, including the forced disappearance and killing of student activists in 1998 and 1999;

(2) The Indonesian government's response to the report of the Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation in Timor-Leste and the June 2006 report of the report to the Secretary-General of the Commission of Experts to Review the Prosecution of Serious Violations of Human Rights in Timor-Leste in 1999;

(3) Steps taken by the Indonesian government to implement and enforce the 2004 Indonesian law which requires the Indonesian military to divest itself of legal and illegal businesses before 2009; and

(4) The extent to which the Indonesian government has removed restrictions impeding access to and travel within the provinces of Papua and West Irian Jaya by United Nations personnel, diplomats, journalists, international non-governmental organization personnel and researchers, humanitarian and human rights workers and others.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES THAT REFUSE TO EXTRADITE TO THE UNITED STATES ANY INDIVIDUAL ACCUSED IN THE UNITED STATES OF KILLING A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER

SEC. 688. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Department of State may be used to provide assistance to the central government of a country which has notified the Department of State of its refusal to extradite to the United States any individual indicted in the United States for killing a law enforcement officer, as specified in a United States extradition request.

GOVERNMENTS THAT HAVE FAILED TO PERMIT CERTAIN EXTRADITIONS

SEC. 689. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Department of State, other than funds provided under the heading "INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT", may be used to provide assistance to the central government of a country with which the United States has an extradition treaty and which government has notified the Department of State of its refusal to extradite to the United States any individual charged with a criminal offense for which the maximum penalty is life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND BUDGET AND HIRING CEILINGS

SEC. 690. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to use the voice of the United States to ensure that any loan, project, agreement, memorandum, instrument, plan or other program of the International Monetary Fund does not penalize countries for increased government spending on healthcare or education by exempting such increases from national budget caps or restraints, hiring or wage bill ceilings or other limits imposed by the International Monetary Fund.

ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 691. (a) FUNDING.—Of the funds appropriated under the heading "DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE", not less than \$501,000,000 shall be made available for programs and activities which directly protect biodiversity and promote clean energy.

(b) CLIMATE CHANGE REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the President's fiscal year 2009 budget request is submitted to Congress, the President shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing in detail the following—

(1) all Federal agency obligations and expenditures, domestic and international, for climate change programs and activities in fiscal year 2009, including an accounting of expenditures by agency with each agency identifying climate change activities and associated costs by line item as presented in the President's Budget Appendix; and

(2) all fiscal year 2007 obligations and estimated expenditures, fiscal year 2008 estimated expenditures and estimated obligations, and fiscal year 2009 requested funds by the United States Agency for International Development, by country and central program, for each of the following:

(A) to promote the transfer and deployment of a wide range of United States clean energy and energy efficiency technologies;

(B) to assist in the measurement, monitoring, reporting, verification, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions;

(C) to promote carbon capture and sequestration measures;

(D) to help meet such countries' responsibilities under the Framework Convention on Climate Change; and

(E) to develop assessments of the vulnerability to impacts of climate change and mitigation and adaptation response strategies.

(c) EXTRACTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES.—(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall inform the managements of the international financial institutions and the public that it is the policy of the United States that any assistance by such institutions (including but not limited to any loan, credit, grant, or guarantee) for the extraction and export of oil, gas, coal, timber, or other natural resource should not be provided unless the government of the country has in place or is taking the necessary steps to establish functioning systems for:

(A) accurately accounting for revenues and expenditures in connection with the extraction and export of the type of natural resource to be extracted or exported;

(B) the independent auditing of such accounts and the widespread public dissemination of the audits; and

(C) verifying government receipts against company payments including widespread dissemination of such payment information, and disclosing such documents as Host Government Agreements, Concession Agreements, and bidding documents, allowing in any such dissemination or disclosure for the redaction of, or exceptions for, information that is commercially proprietary or that would create competitive disadvantage.

(2) Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing, for each international financial institution, the amount and type of assistance provided, by country, for the extraction and export of oil, gas, coal, timber, or other national resource since September 30, 2005.

UZBEKISTAN

SEC. 692. Assistance may be provided to the central Government of Uzbekistan only if the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Uzbekistan is making substantial and continuing progress in meeting its commitments under the "Declaration on the Strategic Partnership and Cooperation Framework Between the Republic of Uzbekistan and the United States of America", including respect for human rights, establishing a genuine multi-party system, and ensuring free and fair elections, freedom of expression, and the independence of the media, and that a credible international investigation of the May 31, 2005, shootings in Andijan is underway with the support of the Government of Uzbekistan: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this section "assistance" shall include excess defense articles.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MINORITY RELIGIOUS FAITHS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 693. None of the funds appropriated for assistance under this Act may be made available for the Government of the Russian Federation, after 180 days from the date of the enactment of this Act, unless the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of the Russian Federation has implemented no statute, executive order, regulation or similar government action that would discriminate, or which has as its principal effect discrimination, against religious groups or religious communities in the Russian Federation in violation of accepted international agreements on human rights and religious freedoms to which the Russian Federation is a party.

WAR CRIMES IN AFRICA

SEC. 694. (a) The Congress reaffirms its support for the efforts of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) and the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) to bring to justice individuals responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity in a timely manner.

(b) Funds appropriated by this Act, including funds for debt restructuring, may be made available for assistance to the central government of a country in which individuals indicted by ICTR and SCSL are credibly alleged to be living, if the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that such government is cooperating with ICTR and SCSL, including the surrender and transfer of indictees in a timely manner: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to assistance provided under section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or to project assistance under title II of this Act: *Provided further*, That the United States shall use its voice and vote in the United Nations Security Council to fully support efforts by ICTR and SCSL to bring to justice individuals indicted by such tribunals in a timely manner.

(c) The prohibition in subsection (b) may be waived on a country by country basis if the President determines that doing so is in the national security interest of the United States: *Provided*, That prior to exercising such waiver authority, the President shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations, in classified form if necessary, on:

(1) the steps being taken to obtain the cooperation of the government in surrendering the indictee in question to the court of jurisdiction;

(2) a strategy, including a timeline, for bringing the indictee before such court; and

(3) the justification for exercising the waiver authority.

COMBATTING PIRACY OF UNITED STATES COPYRIGHTED MATERIALS

SEC. 695. (a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of State may carry out a program of activities to combat piracy in countries that are not members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), including activities as follows:

(1) The provision of equipment and training for law enforcement, including in the interpretation of intellectual property laws.

(2) The provision of training for judges and prosecutors, including in the interpretation of intellectual property laws.

(3) The provision of assistance in complying with obligations under applicable international treaties and agreements on copyright and intellectual property.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION.—In carrying out the program authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, consult with and provide assistance to the World Intellectual Property Organization in order to promote the integration of countries described in subsection (a) into the global intellectual property system.

(c) FUNDING.—Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available under the heading “INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT”, \$5,000,000 may be made available in fiscal year 2008 for the program authorized by subsection (a).

OVERSIGHT OF IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION

SEC. 696. (a) Section 3001 of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (Public Law 108–106; 117 Stat. 1238; 5 U.S.C. App., note to section 8G of Public Law 95–452), as amended by section 1054(b) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364; 120 Stat. 2397), section 2 of the Iraq Reconstruction Accountability Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–440), and section 3801 of the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans’ Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 110–28) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)(1) by striking “pay rates.” and inserting “pay rates, and may exercise the authorities of subsections (b) through (i) of section 3161 of title 5, United States Code (without regard to subsection (a) of such section).”;

(2) in subsection (o)(1)(B) by striking “fiscal year 2006 or fiscal year 2007” and inserting “fiscal years 2006 through 2008”; and

(3) by adding at the end of such section the following subsection:

“(p) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For the purposes of carrying out the duties of the Inspector General, any United States funds appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal years 2006 through 2008 for the reconstruction of Iraq, irrespective of the designation of such funds, shall be deemed to be amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.”.

(b) Section 1054(a) of Public Law 109–364 is amended by striking “fiscal year 2006” and inserting “fiscal years 2006 through 2008”.

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS RENOVATION

SEC. 697. It is the sense of the Congress that the amount of any loan for the renovation

of the United Nations headquarters building located in New York, New York, should not exceed \$600,000,000: *Provided*, That if any loan exceeds \$600,000,000, the Secretary of State shall notify the Congress of the current cost of the renovation and cost containment measures.

NEGLECTED DISEASES

SEC. 698. Of the funds appropriated under the heading “Child Survival and Health Programs Fund”, not less than \$18,000,000 shall be made available to support an integrated response to the control of neglected diseases including intestinal parasites, schistosomiasis, lymphatic filariasis, onchocerciasis, trachoma and leprosy: *Provided*, That the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations, representatives from the relevant international technical and nongovernmental organizations addressing the specific diseases, recipient countries, donor countries, the private sector, UNICEF and the World Health Organization: (1) on the most effective uses of such funds to demonstrate the health and economic benefits of such an approach; and (2) to develop a multilateral, integrated initiative to control these diseases that will enhance coordination and effectiveness and maximize the leverage of United States contributions with those of other donors: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

ASSISTANCE FOR EGYPT

SEC. 699. (a) FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM.—Of the funds appropriated by this Act for Egypt under the heading “FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM”, \$200,000,000 shall not be made available for obligation until the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Egypt has taken concrete and measurable steps to—

(1) enact and implement a new judicial authority law that protects the independence of the judiciary;

(2) review criminal procedures and train police leadership in modern policing to curb police abuses; and

(3) detect and destroy the smuggling network and smuggling tunnels that lead from Egypt to Gaza.

□ 1845

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOUSTANY:

Strike section 699 of the bill (relating to assistance for Egypt).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, first let me start by saying I have deep respect for the work that Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member WOLF have done with this bill. I also have shared the major concerns that both of you have with regard to the internal Egyptian reforms that you’re advo-

cating. I share those same concerns. I am also deeply concerned about the border situation between Egypt and Gaza and the smuggling of arms that’s ongoing.

My amendment takes a step to strike the language in section 699 from the bill that I believe unnecessarily places restrictions on the FMF funding for Egypt. I believe these restrictions are actually harmful to U.S. national strategic interests.

I have to say that clearly Egypt has been a vital strategic partner in the region for many, many years, and this is not the way that the U.S. should treat its friends and reward its friends.

If you look at the record, Egypt has worked with us to expedite the processing of our nuclear warships going through the Suez Canal when otherwise it would take weeks. Also, the Egyptian Government has shared critical intelligence with us across the board, and there has been significant military cooperation for quite some time now.

The other things that have happened is that Egypt has worked hard to maintain the March 1979 Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty. And even as we speak tonight, there are plans being facilitated by Egypt to bring Ehud Olmert and Mahmoud Abbas together at Sharm el-Sheikh next week. So clearly Egypt is trying to do what it can to help facilitate the peace process.

I believe this funding is a critical part of keeping the peace with Israel, maintaining balance in this part of the region. And also I believe it’s in the interest of Israel’s national security as well, in addition to being in our national security interest.

The current language in the bill would place, I believe, unrealistic restrictions. It requires the Secretary of State to provide certain certifications which are going to be very difficult to provide. And it may just simply end up being political cover. And in the interest of good policy, without browbeating our important ally Egypt in this process, I think we can work with them in a more cooperative way as we go forward to achieve the things that we’re trying to achieve, such as getting stability on the border with Gaza, reducing the smuggling of arms, and also moving forward on internal reforms in Egypt itself.

This ally is important. I think we need to work with them. We need to understand their timelines, and work with them and respect that timeline as we go forward.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my good friend from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of his amendment.

Section 699, as proposed in this Foreign Operations bill, risks undermining the significant progress we have made in a vital strategic partnership.

Mr. Chairman, it is critical to remember that our friend and ally Egypt led the Arab world in establishing a model for peaceful cooperation in the Middle East. The Camp David Accords ushered in an unprecedented era of cooperation between Egypt and the United States, as well as between Egypt and Israel. This peace has held for nearly 30 years. The benefits to the world have been very significant, and the consequences, particularly to Egypt, have also been considerable, including the assassination of former President Anwar Sadat.

Egypt has been the cultural and historical center of the Arab world and is poised to play a significant role in fostering peace and maintaining a very delicate balance of stability in the Middle East. Even now, as my colleague mentioned, Egyptian President Mubarak is preparing for an emergency summit with Israeli Prime Minister Olmert, King Abdullah of Jordan, and Palestinian President Abbas to address the potentially explosive situation in Gaza.

Mr. Chairman, I had actually hoped to offer an amendment today to section 699 to help address the serious concerns involving the smuggling of arms, weapons and contraband across the border into Gaza, a pressing concern which has become even more urgent given recent news. However, this amendment would not have been ruled in order.

Mr. Chairman, I fully understand the desire of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to see progress on human rights and civil reform in Egypt. I deeply share this concern as well and eagerly look for the right mechanism to achieve this goal. But I oppose the methodology of penalizing our diplomatic and military cooperation efforts.

U.S.-Middle East policy is complex and a delicate undertaking, at best. And despite the good intentions here, I fear that section 699 could backfire and harm one of our best and most vital strategic relationships in the region.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my colleague. I think he's right on the spot.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. My colleagues, this is a difficult and sensitive issue that the House has debated many times before in many different ways.

We all know that Egypt is an important ally of the United States. We all know that Egypt plays a very important role in the Middle East, and that role will even be more crucial in the months ahead. We all know that Egypt was the first Arab country to have made peace with Israel, and that the peace, while not nearly as warm or as forward-leaning as many of us would have liked, has held for close to 30 years. That is why Egypt has consistently received more foreign assistance in this bill than virtually any country other than Israel. And that is true of this year's bill as well.

Nevertheless, there is a frustration level with our very good ally over two key issues, the Egyptian Government's increasingly harsh response to dissent of any kind and the government's failure to take serious steps to stopping the smuggling from Egypt to Gaza.

When Israel withdrew all of its population and military forces from Gaza nearly 2 years ago, one of the biggest concerns was what to do about Gaza's border with Egypt. Some in Israel argued that Israeli forces should remain at the border to ensure that it did not become an opening to allow the smuggling of weapons and terrorists to Gaza. Those who argue that Israel needed to completely withdraw and that Egypt could effectively play that role ultimately prevailed. Israel and Egypt even reworked parts of their peace agreement to allow for an expanded Egyptian force on that border. Unfortunately, however, those forces have not done the job, have not stopped the smuggling.

As was highlighted so vividly during the recent fighting in Gaza, the forces of Hamas are very well equipped. The bulk of that equipment has come through that border. Especially now that Hamas has effectively taken over in Gaza, it is critically important that Egypt do everything within its power, including stopping these armed shipments before they even get to the Gaza border, to put an end to this deadly arms trade.

The language in the bill does not cut aid to Egypt, which many have wanted to do, I can assure you. It simply fences off a portion of Egypt's assistance, pending a report and certification by the Secretary of State that Egypt is taking steps to, one, enact a new judicial law; two, to curb police abuses; three, to detect and destroy the smuggling network into Gaza.

I believe it is a moderate and reasonable approach to two very difficult and important issues that we have discussed on numerous occasions, to no avail, with our good friends in Egypt.

Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield to my good friend from California, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. LANTOS. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I want to speak very strongly to support her position.

The nightmare that is unfolding in Gaza is in no small measure the responsibility of the Government of Egypt.

Egypt has a huge military, and it boggles the mind to assume that the Egyptian military would not have been able to seal Gaza from the constant flow of drugs, weapons and persons being trafficked into Gaza had they attempted to do so.

Now, we all understand that the prime culprit in Gaza is Hamas, the terrorist organization. A secondary culprit is the previous corrupt regime of Yasser Arafat, which led to the parliamentary victory of Hamas. But the Egyptian Government has a heavy re-

sponsibility for what is the present situation in Gaza. It is a terrorist-controlled area, weapons flowing in, drugs flowing in, trafficked persons flowing in. And to have the minimum of a certification by our Secretary of State that at the very least Egypt at long last has decided to control this very dangerous border is an extremely modest measure. I would have preferred far more severe measures in this regard, but I strongly support this measure.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted to yield 1 minute to Mr. ELLISON.

□ 1900

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman and commend the gentlewoman for her good wisdom and excellent intentions behind section 699 which would conditionalize aid to Egypt. However, I must rise in support of the amendment that has been brought by Mr. BOUSTANY because I believe that the impact of this piece in the bill would signal to the region a very hostile and unhealthy message.

The message that we should be sending to allies in the region is that we want to work constructively and productively to seal that border. I would point out that sealing borders is no easy enterprise. But I also believe that with a greater amount of help and with proper resources that the border could well be sealed between Gaza and Egypt.

This conditionalizing sends a signal that Egypt, that it is criticism of Egypt, that Egypt is somehow not putting forth the proper effort. Given that Egypt is such a long-standing and important ally, I think this is not the right message to send.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is fair to say that no subcommittee chairman presided over the provision of more financial aid to Egypt than I did during the 10 years that I was chairman of the subcommittee.

I think it is also fair to say that I have, on many occasions, tried to see to it that when this body looked at questions in the Middle East that it looked at the interests of all of the parties fairly. But I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

We have a dilemma. Egypt is an important and welcome ally. I have always considered them to be a friend. They have played a very constructive role in the Middle East. But in recent years, I am sad to say, Egypt has displayed an increasingly brutal repression of freedom that is contrary to everything that America is supposed to stand for. We have seen the beating of

demonstrators in Bull Connor fashion. We have seen the jailing of political opponents.

We have to speak out. Unlike some wildly romantic beliefs of some of the neocons in this country, like Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle and the Vice President, I do not naively believe that we can force democracy down the throats of a region that has had little experience with it. We have seen in the case of Hamas how democratic forms can be abused and subverted by undemocratic means. But, nonetheless, I do believe that we have an obligation to expect that countries with whom we are so closely associated will perform within certain norms of decency when it comes to the question of human rights.

To indicate our concern, while still expressing our respect for a treasured friend, we have fenced \$200 million in military aid until the administration can honestly certify that Egypt has greatly improved its human rights conduct and has done more to effectively prevent the illicit supply of arms from being smuggled into Gaza.

In my view, this is a balanced approach. It does not cut off aid. It leaves options open. It certainly leaves a very large amount of military aid to Egypt unfettered in any way whatsoever, enough to continue all existing ongoing military contracts.

It is a balanced approach. It is a nuanced approach. It is aimed at military aid, because only the military in the Egyptian government, in my view, has the influence to make this come to a responsible and friendly conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge rejection of the gentleman's amendment so that America can send a message consistent with our values, while still recognizing our geopolitical relationships.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of the committee's language. In fact, I think the language is very moderate, perhaps even, from my own perspective, a little bit too moderate because I think we could have put some other conditions on it.

Ayman Nour is still in prison. I visited Ayman Nour's wife. He is still in prison. He is not very, very well. We have interceded on his behalf, the Congress and everyone else. But Ayman Nour is still in prison.

The Coptic Christians. The life of the Coptic Christians is worse today than it has been for a long while. So if you're a Coptic Christian in Egypt, you're in trouble.

For the Baha'is, the Baha'is in Egypt just live the most miserable life that you can possibly live. They are not even recognized. They cannot even get a card for a driver's license. They are a nonentity. They are not even there. They are not. So they can't move. They can't do anything.

There is anti-Semitic and anti-Christian editorials and cartoons in their newspapers. Just look at what they say. The government controls those newspapers. So if a government controls a newspaper and anti-Semitism and anti-Christian language is in there, does that not mean that someone in the government is saying that?

Also, the language is moderate. They gunned down the Sudanese. I was there shortly after they gunned down the Sudanese. There are many Sudanese that live there, and they gunned them down. There is police brutality.

The Gaza. The gentleman, Mr. LANTOS, was right with regard to the Gaza. They have a powerful military. They could be doing much, much more.

Egypt is a great nation. It is a great nation. They are great people. They are our friends. But friends have to be honest with friends.

Mr. OBEY was exactly right. We have given them, Mr. OBEY would have this figure better than I would, over \$15 billion. Martin Luther King said, in the end, we will remember not the words that were of our enemies but the silence of our friend. As a friend, for us not to speak out on this issue, we would be derelict in our duty. We would be derelict in our duty.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and in support of it, and would say to the gentlewoman, the Chairwoman, it would have sent a very refreshing message if one of the other conditionalities had been with regard to the Coptic Christians, who are very patriotic people in Egypt and who love their country and who always speak proudly of their country and who always honor their country; and also if we had conditionality language with regard to the Baha'is. But I think Mr. OBEY is right. I agree with the Chairwoman. I would hope that we would defeat the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read: The Clerk read as follows:

RELIEF FOR THE HMONG AND MONTAGNARDS

SEC. 699A. AUTOMATIC RELIEF FOR THE HMONG AND MONTAGNARDS.—Section 212(a)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(3)(B)), is amended by adding at the end the following new clause: "Clause (vi) shall not apply to the Hmong or Montagnards on the basis of any act or event occurring in or before 1975".

TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 212(a)(3)(B)(ii) of the Immigration

and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking "Subclause (VII)" and replacing it with "Subclause (IX)".

REPORT ON ANTI-CORRUPTION ACTIVITIES

SEC. 699B. (a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than May 1, 2008, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, shall submit to Committees on Appropriations a report on the level of corruption in each country that receives assistance in this Act under the heading "Development Assistance", "Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States", or "Assistance for the States of the Former Soviet Union".

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) assess the level of corruption in each country's political, economic, and judicial sectors, including detailed information regarding specific acts of corruption;

(2) assess the extent to which recent elections in each country have been free and fair;

(3) include information regarding steps each country has taken to combat corruption;

(4) describe at the program, project, and activity level how the United States assistance is designed to strengthen anti-corruption activities in each country, including specific outcome goals and objectives; and

(5) include an identification of countries that the Secretary of State determines require special scrutiny for fiscal year 2009, including an identification of countries that the Secretary determines are not making significant efforts to comply with minimum standards for anti-corruption activities.

(c) METHODOLOGY.—Not later than September 30, 2007, the Secretary of State shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations a detailed description of—

(1) the methodology for assessing the level of corruption in each country for purposes of preparing the report required by subsection (a) and for evaluating each country's annual progress in fighting corruption; and

(2) the indicators upon which the Secretary will make such assessments.

PROGRAMS TO IMPROVE DEMOCRACY, THE RULE OF LAW, AND GOVERNANCE IN IRAN

SEC. 699C. Of the funds appropriated in this Act, \$50,000,000 should be made available for programs to improve democracy, the rule of law, and governance in Iran.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. GINGREY: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for negotiating the participation of additional countries under the visa waiver program described in section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I believe our Nation needs to secure its points of entry, and specifically I believe that we should prevent additional countries from joining the United States visa waiver program until we have technical and human resources to secure our points of entry. I do not believe our Nation can afford to allow more visitors in the United States without screening them prior to arrival.

This amendment would prevent funds from being used to negotiate additional visa waiver countries. The State Department should not be using funds to negotiate new visa waivers until the machine-readable and tamper-resistant biometric identification standards that were mandated by the U.S. PATRIOT Act as a cornerstone of the entry-exit system are fully operational. We refer to that, Mr. Chairman, as the US-VISIT program. There are currently 27 visa waiver countries, and I believe it is too risky to negotiate additional countries without first having our security screening system in place.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to provide more opportunities for terrorists to breach a loophole in our security. How much time does our Nation have before ICE, the Immigration Customs Enforcement, the air marshals or the TSA, Transportation Security Administration, misses the next Richard Reid?

For example, Habib Zacarias Moussaoui, a French citizen of Moroccan descent, a name we all know very well, actually used his French passport, without a U.S. visa, on February 23, 2001. He flew from London to Chicago and on to Oklahoma City, where he began the flight training at an aviation school.

Fortunately, on August 16, 2001, INS arrested Moussaoui because he had remained in the United States well beyond the 90 days that were allowed under the visa waiver program entrants and he was in violation of the requirement that visa waiver program travelers enter for business or tourism. Had INS and law enforcement not been literally on top of their game, Mr. Speaker, Moussaoui could have been a part of the 9/11 attacks. That was his intent. We stopped him, but he was here on a visa waiver.

A more recent example can be summarized in a June 18, just this month, 2007, ABC News reported about suicide bombers who were sent to the United States and Europe after being trained in Afghanistan. The story references this recent terrorist video where the Taliban military commander, Mansoor Dadullah, is found saying in this video, "These Americans, Canadians, British and Germans, come here to Afghanistan from faraway places." This story further confirms, Mr. Speaker, what we already know: Terrorist forces are recruiting from the Western World, the same countries who are established members of our visa waiver program.

I feel that we cannot continue a loophole that allows homegrown European terrorists access to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the visa waiver program was only designed to be a temporary program for a small and select group of nations, starting with the U.K., Japan and France. Now, 27 countries participate in the visa waiver program, believe me, enough to keep ICE and TSA exceedingly busy. Do we really need to fund efforts to add a 28th and 29th country to their list of responsibilities?

I just don't want to see our Nation attacked because we couldn't carry through with our commitment to security first. I ask my colleagues, please, support this commonsense Gingrey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, I have mixed feelings about this amendment. I don't think that the appropriations bill is the proper place to consider issues that are clearly authorization issues, and yet I know that there is considerable concern about this program.

Let me simply say that in the interests of time and because I think the equities are split, that we would be willing to accept the gentleman's amendment, with the understanding that we would need to give the administration an opportunity in conference to express any concerns about it and consider any adjustments that might be made that would be mutually agreed to.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for yielding, and I certainly appreciate his willingness to understand the necessity of the amendment. Indeed, I appreciate it and will agree to that, and hope the administration will follow through on the amendment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. TANCREDO

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. TANCREDO:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS RELATING TO RESTRICTIONS ON RELATIONS WITH TAIWAN

SEC. 6XX. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce any of the provisions in the Memorandum to all Department and Agency Executive Secretaries dated, February 2, 2001, and entitled "Guidelines on Relations With Taiwan".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Tancredo-Chabot amendment would prevent the State Department from expending any funds to enforce several arbitrary and archaic guidelines that inhibit or altogether prevent U.S. officials from communicating with their counterparts in Taiwan. These restrictions range from just silly to downright absurd.

Among other things, the so-called guidelines do not permit meetings with Taiwanese diplomats or elected officials in State Department buildings, the White House or Old Executive Office Building. They prevent executive branch personnel from the Foreign Affairs agencies and those above the rank of GS-14 from attending Taiwan's annual reception in Washington. They prevent executive branch personnel from attending meetings at Twin Oaks, the former residence of Taiwan's Ambassador here in Washington. They prevent travel to Taiwan by officials above a certain rank from the Defense Department and the State Department. They prohibit executive branch personnel from corresponding directly with Taiwan officials.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would be prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment, with the understanding that the committee will continue to investigate the effect of the amendment as we take it to conference with the other body later in the year.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I will be very brief. I appreciate the gentleman and I don't want to take time here. I would just make a couple of points.

This amendment is long overdue. Taiwan is our friend. It is a longtime democratic ally and a major trading partner. Just across the Taiwan Strait you have Communist China, with its more than 900 missiles pointed directly at Taiwan. China operates under a dictatorship. Its human rights record is abysmal. It ignores the rule of law. It practices religious persecution. It warehouses political prisoners. It carries out an unconscionable coercive abortion policy. Yet when it comes to dealing with the two nations diplomatically, we often treat Taiwan like a pariah nation and kowtow to the Beijing bullies.

So I would commend the gentleman from Colorado for bringing forth this amendment, and I want to thank the distinguished chairman for accepting the amendment.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, as co-chair of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for too long, we have allowed China to dictate our relationship with Taiwan.

If anything, it should be the other way around. Taiwan consistently holds free and fair democratic elections. Taiwan respects human rights and labor standards. Taiwan is a free, democratic nation.

As the greatest democracy in the history of the world, we have an obligation to support other democracies and nurture them around the globe. We must be a beacon, a light to the world, showing the way forward for other democracies. Only then, will democracy finally flourish—and only if we show the way.

Mr. Chairman, our priorities are backwards when we place China's concerns ahead of a democratic country's. We must end these arbitrary and archaic restrictions on our relations with Taiwan. I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's offer, and I yield back the balance of my time and accept the offer you have made to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. HERSETH SANDLIN SANDLIN

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 27 offered by Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN :

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the diversity visa program under sections 201(e), 203(c), or 204(a)(1)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(e), 1153(c), and 1154(a)(1)(I)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan amendment that is cosponsored by my colleague and good friend from Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, as well as Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon, Mr. LAMAR SMITH of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN of California and Mr. TANCREDI of Colorado.

The amendment is simple and straightforward. It would prohibit the use of funds in the bill to implement the Diversity Visa Program otherwise known as the "visa lottery."

The visa lottery program was established in 1990 and awards about 50,000 permanent-resident visas to foreign nationals by conducting a random lottery. In the last Congress, the State Department's inspector general testified before Congress that the Office of the Inspector General "continues to believe that the Diversity Visa Program contains significant risks to national security from hostile intelligence offi-

cers, criminals and terrorists attempting to use the program for entry into the United States as permanent residents."

If for no other reason, national security is too important to allow this institutional randomness in our immigration policy. The visa lottery injects a level of unnecessary and responsible uncertainty into the immigration process. Our amendment is a practical provision that will make our Nation safer.

When the House considered its immigration bill in the 109th Congress, the gentleman from Virginia and I joined together to offer an amendment eliminating the visa lottery program, and it passed with strong bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to provide similarly strong support to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from South Dakota for yielding and for her leadership in bringing forth this amendment, which corrects a grievous problem with our immigration system.

This visa lottery program is clearly unfair to lawful immigrant applicants who are abiding by our rules and going through the process. It pushes 50,000 people chosen totally at random ahead of hundreds of thousands of law-abiding immigrants waiting to be reunified with their families.

The program is wrought with fraud. The State Department inspector general has said that the visa lottery program is subject to widespread abuse, and that identity fraud is endemic, and fraudulent documents are commonplace.

A simple click on the State Department's visa lottery Web site is very revealing. The first thing you will notice on that Web site is a warning in bold red font about fraudulent websites and individuals. Indeed, a cottage industry has sprung up of individuals using the visa lottery program to take advantage of foreign nationals.

No skills are necessary to enter the lottery. As we look around the country for programs that help meet needs of reunifying families or job skills for which there is a shortage in the United States, we have a program that gives 50,000 visas based on pure luck, and the applicants must only have the equivalent of a high school diploma. But the State Department has indicated they often have very few resources to make even this determination in countries that do not have systems similar to the United States.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it is a national security threat. This program of selection purely at random makes it possible for visa lottery participants to be people who are from countries that are known to be state sponsors of terror. Nothing would prevent terrorist organizations from submitting numerous names for the lottery, and, as long as they don't have

criminal backgrounds, they can receive not just a temporary visa like the 9/11 hijackers had, but a permanent-resident visa to be permanently in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman. The visa lottery program is based on the absurd notion that the group of people coming to the United States are insufficiently diverse. There has never been such a diverse group of people.

The diversity lottery discriminates against those who live in Mexico, China or the Philippines on the theory, an absurd theory, that an immigrant from Paraguay will add more to American culture than one from Mexico. I think it is time to end this absurd cultural discrimination.

It makes sense for our country to let people come here for family unification or because the immigrant brings special skills. The diversity lottery admits people who bring neither. They need no family ties nor special skills.

Our other immigration programs require that the person either have a job or a family member who will issue an affidavit of support. Those coming here under the visa lottery have neither, and therefore are free to become a charge to our taxpayers.

I look forward to having a comprehensive immigration law so that our immigration laws make sense, but let's kill the one element of our immigration laws that make the least sense now. We shouldn't discriminate against those with family in the United States, those with special skills, or those from Mexico, China or the Philippines, on the theory that somehow we enhance our culture more by admitting immigrants from one country as opposed to another.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for a brief discussion on the issue of the persecution of Coptic Christians in Egypt.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to see a subject touched on here and would hope that Chairman OBEY would be aware that under the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill for 2008, \$200 million of the \$1.3 billion military assistance for Egypt will be withheld until the Secretary of State certifies that the Government of Egypt has taken concrete steps to reform its judiciary, to curb police abuses and address concerns about the smuggling of weapons from Egypt to Gaza.

I strongly support this provision, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to request that an additional provision, if the chairman would consider it at some

point, be added to ensure that the Government of Egypt also increase protections for human rights according to Egypt's own international human rights commitments, including the religious freedom of members of religious minorities, such as the Coptic Christians and Baha'is, among others.

I just hope, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the committee would be so inclined at some point, if we could work with him in any way.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, at this point I am simply standing in for the subcommittee chair, but I would simply say that while I am not frankly as totally familiar with the issue as I am with, for instance, the record of the Egyptian Government in jailing Mr. Nour and other political opponents, I certainly have seen that concern expressed many times, and I would think the conferees would be interested in improving human rights records on Egypt's part with respect to all groups, including Coptic Christians.

□ 1930

Mr. WOLF. I thank the chairman of the committee and thank the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member claim the time in opposition to the amendment of the gentlewoman from South Dakota?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. With respect to the amendment of the gentlewoman, I have some considerable disquiet about the Appropriations Committee on the basis of 3 minutes discussion pronouncing judgment on complicated matters with respect to immigration, but let me simply say I would be willing to accept the amendment as an expression of concern on the subject and would hope that the administration would deal with the concerns as the committee goes to conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TANCREDO

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TANCREDO:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended in violation of section 243(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1253(d)) (relating to discontinuing granting visas to nationals of countries denying or delaying accepting aliens removed from the United States).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June

20, 2007, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply prevent the State Department from continuing to selectively ignore Federal statute.

The Federal statute in question instructs the State Department to discontinue the issuance of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas to citizens of countries who refuse our attempts to repatriate or deport their nationals. As I mentioned, the State Department often chooses to disregard this statute.

In fact, some dozen nations around the world routinely refuse to accept their citizens who have come here illegally or violated the terms of their visas. Iraq is just one example. As a result, Iraqi aliens who would otherwise be deported are free to remain in the United States.

Last year, I sent a letter to Secretary Chertoff asking why an Iraqi national by the name of Gavan Alkadi was not deported but instead was released into the public. Gavan Alkadi have been convicted of an aggravated felony and has been arrested nearly 70 times in Colorado.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TANCREDO. I would yield to the chairman.

Mr. OBEY. As I understand this amendment, it simply indicates that the Department ought to enforce the law. I am not really inclined to object to that. In the interest of time, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. TANCREDO. I appreciate the gentleman's offer.

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for offering this amendment with me. I'll be brief because I don't think many Members here need to be convinced that we need our Government agencies to enforce the laws we give them and that they aren't arbitrary.

Section 243(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act allows the State Department to discontinue the issuance of visas to nations who fail to take back their nationals who have been ordered removed by our Government.

Unfortunately, this step by our Government has never been taken. Why? The gentleman from Colorado and I joined on a letter to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General to ask this very question. The chart I have here indicates the response we received and I quote:

Department of Homeland Security Response: "While visa sanctions under Section 243(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act may be an effective tool in obtaining repatriation cooperation, the severity that makes them potentially effective also has the potential to negatively impact other U.S. foreign relations objectives if not used judiciously. When considering the use of 243(d) sanctions, DHS must consider the potential repercussions to U.S. foreign policy. Because the United States is pursuing a number of initiatives with China on foreign policy issues, implementing Section 243(d) sanctions could have counterproductive ef-

fects."—Donald H. Kent, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, January 10, 2007.

Mr. Chairman, how this reads to me is that our trade with nations like China is more important than providing for the safety of the American people. Many of the people who we are trying to remove are hardened criminals, violent felons that we want off our streets. Because of two recent Supreme Court decisions, our government is limited in the length of time we can hold them in our jails while working to remove them. If we can't remove them in 6 months, they are to be set free. Now how many are we talking about here? As this chart shows, here are the top offending countries and the number roaming America:

TABLE 14.—BREAKDOWN IN THE NUMBER OF ILLEGAL ALIENS FROM COUNTRIES THAT BLOCK OR INHIBIT REPATRIATION

[As of June 29, 2004]

Eight countries	Detained criminal non-criminal	Non-detained criminal/non-criminal	Total
Vietnam	352	5,807	6,159
Jamaica	715	11,568	12,283
Iran	105	7,039	7,144
India	253	28,540	28,793
Ethiopia	108	4,454	4,562
Eritrea	21	637	658
China	885	72,315	73,200
Laos	140	3,302	3,442
Total	2,579	133,662	136,241

During FY 2003, the detention of criminal/non-criminal aliens from the top eight uncooperative countries that block or inhibit repatriation consumed 981,202 detention days and \$83 million.
Source: DRO.

According to a Department of Homeland Security Inspector General audit in April 2006, "The difficulty that ICE is experiencing removing illegal aliens with final orders has, in effect, created a mini-amnesty program for tens of thousands of illegal aliens that are subject to removal from the U.S. It also encourages individuals from non-cooperating countries such as China, India, and Iran to make attempts to enter the U.S. illegally.

So let me close by again saying this amendment that I and the gentleman from Colorado are offering just says to enforce existing law. Unless these nations believe that they will not obtain a visa in the future, nothing is ever going to change.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIPINSKI:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase light bulbs for operations in the United States unless the light bulbs have the "ENERGY STAR" or "Federal Energy Management Program" designation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this amendment says that none of the funds made available in this bill may be used to purchase light bulbs for operation in the United States unless the light bulbs have the "Energy Star" or the "Federal Energy Management Program" designation. What this means is that light bulbs purchased will have to be high-efficiency light bulbs.

Right now, the most common high-efficiency bulbs are the compact fluorescent light bulb, known as a CFL. CFLs use approximately 75 percent less energy than incandescent bulbs to provide the same amount of light. They also last approximately eight to ten times longer. Replacing an ordinary bulb with a comparable CFL saves up to \$74 in energy costs over the bulb's lifetime.

Today, Americans are rightly concerned about the impact of foreign energy dependence on our national security and the effect of global climate change on the future of our planet. This amendment helps us address both of these issues, while at the same time saving millions of taxpayer dollars.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPINSKI. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. OBEY. In light of the fact that you and the other sponsors of the amendment have worked to narrow the scope of the amendment to just the funds that are involved to operations in the United States, the committee would be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Reclaiming my time, I would like to thank the chairman for accepting this. This is part of what we are working on.

I introduced a bill to require all GSA buildings to use high-efficiency bulbs. Mr. INGLIS and I introduced this earlier this year. It is included in a comprehensive climate change bill which was reported by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee yesterday. I am very hopeful we can get this done through that piece of legislation for all GSA buildings, but this amendment here is a good start.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "Foreign Military Financing Program", not more than \$250,000,000 may be made available for Pakistan.

(b) CORRESPONDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available for "United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund", and reducing the amount made available for "Foreign Military Financing Program", by \$50,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am offering with my good friends from Washington and New York simply shifts \$50 million from military aid for Pakistan to the Emergency Refugee and Mitigation Assistance Account. It would leave \$250 million in Pakistani military aid, the same level that appeared in the chairwoman's original mark.

In many areas of Federal spending, Congress has to make tough choices amongst important competing priorities. However, the choice between more military aid for Pakistan and assistance for refugees should be an easy one.

Anybody who has witnessed the news in recent weeks understands the military dictatorship in Pakistan has had serious problems in terms of its treatment of civil society. It is one of the worst nuclear proliferators, which could not occur without the knowledge of the Pakistani government. Yet it has been the third-largest recipient of military aid from the United States since 9/11, receiving \$10 billion over the last 6 years.

Despite all that, Pakistan continues to allow the Taliban to operate in many parts of Pakistan and launch attacks against U.S. troops in Afghanistan. In fact, according to CQ Weekly, a U.S. Army officer stationed in Pakistan recently recalled watching a 2-mile-long line of Taliban fighters and suicide bombers walk across the border into Afghanistan unchallenged by Pakistani security forces.

Pakistan even has a "peace agreement" with the Taliban and other terrorists in one province along the Afghan border and agreed to slash military patrols in areas with a substantial al Qaeda presence.

At the same time, Pakistan's military dictator, General Musharraf, has dismissed the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pakistan and attempted to introduce restrictions on its television media.

Forty pro-democracy protesters recently killed by security forces; and, since 2001, over 1,000 people have disappeared.

On the other hand, Iraq is the fastest-growing refugee crisis in the world. There have been 4 million innocent Iraqis who have been driven from their homes by violence and threats, including tens of thousands who are at risk because they helped the United States.

This humanitarian crisis is rapidly becoming a regional security crisis, as Jordan and Syria are at risk of being destabilized by the millions of Iraqis they have taken in, 2 million Iraqis in Jordan and Syria.

Despite this, efforts to provide assistance in the region are dramatically underfunded. The United States has admitted only 70 refugees since October, only one in April and one in May. It is not getting better. It is getting worse. I think this is a blot on Congress as well as the administration, turning its back on these refugees.

Adding \$50 million in Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance will allow assistance to reach more displaced Iraqis and help mitigate the impacts of the refugee crisis on other countries in the Middle East. This amendment offered by Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CROWLEY and myself has the support of the United States Committee for Refugees and Immigrants, Refugees International, the U.S.-India PAC, the U.S.-India Business Alliance and others who are deeply concerned about this humanitarian crisis.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I must very reluctantly lodge a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The amendment proposes to appropriate funds in excess of the authorized amount. It therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI, and I would ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule. The proponent of an item of appropriation carries the burden of persuasion on the question whether it is supported by an authorization in law.

Section 2 of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, codified at 22 U.S.C. 2601, establishes the Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund and provides an authorization of appropriation not to exceed \$100 million at any given time. The bill appropriates \$45 million, and the amendment by the gentleman from Oregon appropriates another \$50 million.

Although the amendment would take the total for the fund to \$95 million in the bill, and thus ostensibly within the authorized level, the committee report on page 112 states that an additional \$55 million was appropriated by Public Law 110-28. Those funds remain available until expended.

Having reviewed this information, the Chair is unable to conclude that the item of appropriation in question is authorized in law.

The Chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORBES:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading "Economic Support Fund" may be made available for Ethiopia.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have at the desk is a simple, straightforward amendment. This amendment says that none of the funds under the Economic Support Fund may be made available to Ethiopia.

In 2005, Ethiopia held democratic elections for the first time. As in any election, there were winners and losers. The opposition party won so many seats in that election that the ruling party immediately moved to limit the power of the parliament, stripping it of the power to craft a budget and allowing discussion exclusively on issues approved by the prime minister.

When protests grew after several members refused to participate in the new government, violence ensued; and the opposition political leaders were arrested. Thousands of protesters were arrested since October 31, 2005; and, thankfully, most of them have been released. However, nearly 2 years later, 38 prisoners from the protest remain incarcerated.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORBES. I would yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman has persuaded me. I would be happy to accept the amendment in the interest of time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia Beach, Mrs. DRAKE.

Mrs. DRAKE. I rise today to speak about a true freedom fighter, a man whose sense of the rule of law and democracy has kept him in prison for the past 2 years. Mr. Chairman, I rise

today to speak for my constituent from Virginia Beach, Dr. Yacob Haile-Mariam.

In 2005, Ethiopia held their national parliamentary elections. Dr. Yacob Haile-Mariam, a citizen of Ethiopia, resigned his position as professor at Norfolk State University and was elected to the parliament as a member of the opposition party.

Soon after the election, Dr. Haile-Mariam was arrested. Last week, the Ethiopian tribunal, adjudicating this matter hastily and without notice, terminated the proceedings and found him guilty of the charges against him. Dr. Haile-Mariam faces sentencing, including the possibility of the death sentence.

□ 1945

Mr. Chairman, the conviction of Dr. Haile-Mariam and other members of the opposition party is adverse to the principles of democracy, freedom and human rights that the United States promotes across the globe. More importantly, the conviction of these individuals is contrary to the commitment Ethiopia has made in recent years to engage in a civil society and establish a democratic government which respects the rule of law, due process and international principles of human rights.

The injustice of Dr. Haile-Mariam's imprisonment has been felt throughout Hampton Roads, most particularly by his loving and supportive family. I have been in contact with his brave wife, Tegist, and officials at the State Department since 2005 seeking a positive resolution to this unfortunate situation. While I do not believe decreasing funds from this particular account would expedite the release of Dr. Haile-Mariam, I could not stand by without speaking for a man whose voice has been taken from him.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. McGovern:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE INSTITUTE FOR SECURITY COOPERATION

SEC. 6XX. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for programs at the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation located at Fort Benning, Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It ensures that no funds in this bill can be used for programs at the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, otherwise known as WHINSEC. It does not affect the funds in the Defense appropriations bill where the majority of WHINSEC's funding is provided.

Last year was the first debate on the WHINSEC, the successor to the U.S. Army School of the Americas. Since last year, the WHINSEC has made a number of very disturbing decisions that bring into question its much-vaunted commitment to transparency and democratic values.

For example, last year's debate brought to light a number of human rights cases involving WHINSEC students and instructors. Instead of using these cases as an opportunity to review its practices and procedures, instead of strengthening the vetting process and fixing any problems that might exist, the WHINSEC chose to attack the messengers.

It asserted that Salvadoran Colonel Francisco del Cid Diaz, responsible for the notorious 1983 Las Hojas massacre, never attended the WHINSEC. I guess they didn't check their own records because here is his name on the list of 2003 graduates.

They attacked the reputation of the current Bolivian Human Rights Ombudsman, Waldo Albarracin, saying that he has no recollection of the military captain who had him kidnapped and tortured in 1997, the same Major Urzagaste who was at the WHINSEC in 2002. When Mr. Albarracin heard of this slander, he sent me a letter describing what happened to him and the role of Urzagaste.

Mr. Chairman, like similar cases regarding corruption charges against three Colombian officers who attended the school, the WHINSEC dismissed the horror of Mr. Albarracin's torture as without merit because the courts dropped the case. Are WHINSEC officials ignorant about how military officers acted with impunity in Bolivia during the 1990s? Or in El Salvador during the 1980s? Are they ignorant of how the Colombian military benefits from the worst culture of impunity in the hemisphere today? The fact that charges of kidnapping, torture, murder, drug trafficking and corruption are routinely dropped is a major problem with Latin American militaries, not a virtue. Even more disturbing is how the WHINSEC responded to criticism. It chose to build a fortress around itself, to make sure that no one in the public, no human rights organization, no foreign policy analyst, would be able to review the names of WHINSEC's graduates and instructors. For the first time in the history of WHINSEC, including the 40-year history of its infamous predecessor, the

School of the Americas, Freedom of Information Act requests are being denied. I have in my hands the school's response regarding 2005 graduates. Every single name is blacked out. Look at it, 18 pages, completely redacted. Is this anyone's idea of transparency? Of open relations with human rights and other policy organizations? This was a deliberate choice. The practice of secrecy extends to WHINSEC's public relations materials, where not a single solitary name of any of its Latin American students or teachers appears. So blacking out the names of graduates wasn't a mistake. It wasn't an anomaly. It's a deliberate decision to keep information secret, to avoid any kind of independent scrutiny or oversight.

Is this the example we want our Latin American counterparts to copy? I hope not, Mr. Chairman.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. POMEROY). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank you and I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, there is a security fence around Fort Benning, but I would not describe the home of the Infantry as a fortress by any stretch of the imagination, as my colleague just referred.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. Once more, my good friend, and he is my good friend, from Massachusetts has so confused the record that it's really tough to know where to begin. But let me try.

He argues that we need to shut down WHINSEC because nearly 30 years ago, several graduates of a different program, the School of the Americas, were found to have committed atrocities in their home countries, a tenuous conclusion indeed. I wonder if he would argue that we should shut down Harvard because the Unabomber actually took some classes there. Mr. Chairman, of course he wouldn't. Because my friend knows that when a student does something awful years after graduating, you can't reasonably hold the school accountable. And to do so would let one man's action deny thousands more the opportunity to grow and to learn. Essentially it would be throwing the baby out with the bath water.

So let's set the record straight, Mr. Chairman. Over 60,000 members of Latin American security forces have trained at WHINSEC and its predecessor since the inception of the school; 99.99 percent have served their countries with honor and distinction. This is the fact.

In order to ensure that known human rights offenders are not attending WHINSEC, potential participants undergo background checks by the Bu-

reau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor and the Department of State, not vetted by WHINSEC.

So I am proud to say, Mr. Chairman, that not one single credible accusation of human rights violations has been lodged against a graduate of WHINSEC. Not one. And I don't want the gentleman or my colleagues necessarily to take my word for this. I want to submit for the RECORD a letter from the United States Department of State, actually from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Patrick Duddy, in response to the Chairman of the Board of Visitors, the school board, WHINSEC school board, to Bishop Morlino dated January 7, 2007.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2007.

Bishop ROBERT C. MORLINO,
Chairman, Board of Visitors, Western Hemisphere Institute of Security Cooperation.

DEAR BISHOP MORLINO: I would like to extend my congratulations on your unanimous selection by the Board of Visitors (BoV) members as incoming chairman for 2007. My representative at the December 2006 meeting has conveyed to me the BoV's request for additional information regarding vetting of attendees at U.S. Government-funded security training covered by the Leahy Amendment. As I mentioned in my previous letter, the Department of State is committed to implementing that law's restrictions on support for security units for which credible evidence of human rights violations exists. The Department has vetted tens of thousands of training participants. We have expanded the scope of our vetting to include individuals as well as units. The vetting process includes a local background check by our embassies, as well as checks by bureaus with regional responsibilities (e.g., the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs) and by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. The Department of State maintains the Abuse Case Evaluation System (ACES), which is a central database that aggregates human rights abuse data into a single, searchable location and facilitates analysis of the data's validity. Personnel involved in the Leahy vetting process use this database as a resource for checking abuse allegations when conducting vetting requests. If all checks come back negative, the Embassy is notified that the individual is cleared for participation in training. The Department vetting process is extremely thorough, and one in which WHINSEC itself plays no role.

As we have noted earlier, we find no evidence to substantiate any claims that the individuals in my previous letter were not properly vetted. We have no additional information Colonel Francisco Del Cid of El Salvador. As you will recall, I stated in my previous letter that we have no record of Del Cid participating in any programs subject to the provisions of the Leahy Amendment. Additional information regarding the other cases is as follows:

Captain Filmann Urzagaste of Bolivia attended a WHINSEC program in 2002. It was alleged that he was involved the 1997 kidnapping of Waldo Albarracin, then a Bolivian human rights official. The Bolivian Supreme Court declared the charges to be without merit. Albarracin himself, in a recent interview with U.S. Embassy personnel in La Paz, made no mention of Urzagaste. When directly asked whether Urzagaste had been involved, Albarracin indicated that he had no recollection of Urzagaste. The Bolivian Supreme Court's website may be consulted for

further information: <http://www.tribunalconstitucional.gov.bo/resolucion1040.html>

With regard to the three Colombian officers mentioned (Captain Dario Sierro Chapeta; Lieutenant Colonel Francisco Patino Fonseca, and Captain Luis Benavides Guancha), we have no record of any allegations regarding human rights violations. Our records indicate that Dario Sierro and Patino Fonseca attended WHINSEC in 2002, followed by Benavides Guancha in 2003. A Colombian police internal investigation into alleged corruption by the three came to light after they attended WHINSEC and were back in Colombia. The three were absolved as the charges were found to be unfounded and described as unsubstantiated allegations. The Colombian Attorney General's office has posted a short article on the case at: <http://www.fiscalia.gov.co/pag/divulgainoticias2005/anticorruptcorruptNasNov17.htm>.

Thank you for your inquiry.

Sincerely,

PATRICK DUDDY,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, every year the gentleman from Massachusetts states that participation in WHINSEC is declining as Latin American nations grow weary of our influence. However, the numbers tell a different story. In 2005, 686 students from Latin America attended WHINSEC. In 2006 that number doubled, up to 1,217. And we saw Brazil for the first time, a fact that can't be overlooked as they have begun to participate, and they are the neighbors of who else but Hugo Chavez in Venezuela.

Another important fact the gentleman eschews is that the School of the Americas closed in 1999. That school closed. WHINSEC opened a year and a half later, in 2001, totally revamped its curriculum. The mission for WHINSEC, Mr. Chairman, could not be clearer. It's threefold: to provide professional education and training to military personnel, law enforcement officials and civilians. Number two, foster cooperation among participating nations. Thirdly, to promote democratic values and, let me emphasize, respect for human rights.

Mr. Chairman, WHINSEC has consistently accomplished all of these goals, strengthening security cooperation between the United States and Latin America. In fact, the House Armed Services Committee recognized this as much as 2 weeks ago when we unanimously voted to recommend that the Department of Defense continue utilizing WHINSEC to strengthen security cooperation in the western hemisphere. The fiscal year 08 National Defense Authorization Act, which included this provision, passed this body overwhelmingly by a vote of 397-27.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. The gentleman hasn't been listening to me. The State Department letter that he is quoting is essentially a whitewash. That State Department letter says that Cid Diaz, who I mentioned who is responsible for the Las Hojas massacre, never attended the WHINSEC. I just showed you right here. This is from the WHINSEC. He

did. So the State Department was wrong. The State Department letter says that the Human Rights Ombudsman in Bolivia can't remember who his torturer was. I have a letter here from the Bolivian Ombudsman that says he feels he was slandered. So that letter is wrong. And I have proof that it is wrong.

And you talk about accountability. Where's the accountability? This is the first time ever that we can't track the graduates. The school doesn't want to track the graduates. They say they don't have the time. So it has been up to human rights organizations. This is what we get in return. How do we know? How does anybody know? We need to do a better job.

So you didn't listen to my statement, I would say respectfully to the gentleman from Georgia. What the State Department sent to you is wrong and I have the proof.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment and I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for offering it.

By prohibiting any funding in this bill from being used for the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, formerly the infamous U.S. Army School of the Americas located at Fort Benning, Georgia, we can stand up for human rights, we can honor our principles and send a strong message to the world.

The School of the Americas has been associated with human rights abuses, with many of its students linked to Latin American coups and vicious death squads. In 1989, graduates from the school killed six Jesuit priests, a housekeeper and her daughter in El Salvador. And today they have a new name, but they have not changed the school's old patterns of abuse and conflict. The institute continues admitting and graduating known human rights abusers. Yes, Colonel Francisco del Cid Diaz, for example, who commanded a unit responsible for a notorious massacre of indigenous people in El Salvador in 1983, then attended the institute on our own soil as recently as 2003. And there are others just like him. It is clear that the institute continually fails not only to fully investigate the prior history of its students but also to track their activity after graduation. That is why nations like Costa Rica, Argentina and Uruguay have terminated their relationship with the institute. It is clear neither those nations nor this one have anything to gain by supporting an institution with such a marred, violent history.

One hundred sixty-seven U.S. Catholic bishops agree. They have written Congress in support of this amendment and called for the institute's closure, recognizing that many of its graduates have consistently targeted Catholic clergy and lay workers across Latin

America. As a Congresswoman, a Catholic and an American, I believe every action that we take sends the whole world a clear message about our priorities and values as a Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support the McGovern amendment, make it clear we are serious about human rights and that the United States of America does not train murderers or killers and that we take the loss of human life seriously.

□ 2000

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend and colleague from the great State of Georgia. The gentleman represents Fort Benning in Muscogee County, and it gives me great pleasure at this time to yield to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my friend, Mr. GINGREY, for doing this and his tireless work on presenting the WHINSEC good faith that they do.

Mr. Chairman, it's a shame that every year defenders of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation have to fight for its very existence. But the annual efforts of my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, and others to close this important institution at least gives us a regular opportunity to discuss the great work done at WHINSEC in a national forum.

It also gives Members of the House a chance to show their support for this educational institution that spreads American know-how and American values to our neighbors and allies throughout Latin America.

At least since the administration of Woodrow Wilson, presidents and congressional leaders of both parties have included promotion of democracy throughout our hemisphere and the rest of the world as a central tenet of U.S. foreign policy. The last 20 years have witnessed significant global progress in scores of countries. From the southern tip of South America to the northern reaches of Central Europe and throughout the Pacific Rim, the oppressed have become liberated.

From the beginning of our Nation, we have belief that the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness comes not from man or from law; those rights are God-given. Thus, we know as Americans that we can't take all the credit for the growth of liberty and human rights, but we can take pride that our Nation has served for more than 100 years as the loudest voice, the greatest advocate and the fiercest defender of democracy, liberty and individual determination.

When we must, we wield the stick. We have fought and shed blood for democracy on the beaches of Normandy, the jungles of Vietnam and the deserts of Iraq.

When we can, we wield the carrot. We promote our values to foreign students and our world-leading university system by increasing development

through trade agreements and through targeted foreign aid.

WHINSEC is a great example of the carrot approach. It's a positive influence through soft power. In other words, it's a positive influence through education and training.

WHINSEC is based at Fort Benning, the world's largest infantry training center, which is in my district. Fort Benning plays a huge role in training the U.S. Army, the greatest fighting force in the history of the world. Manuals currently used at WHINSEC are identical to those used to train all U.S. Army personnel. WHINSEC operates the most advanced and sophisticated military human rights training program in the world.

Comparable training is not available from any other nation or in any other American training facility. Without WHINSEC, Latin American militaries would not have any access to training in military human rights.

In the past 20 to 30 years, we have seen great transition in the Latin American countries from the chains of totalitarianism towards the freedom of democracy. We have seen democratically elected governments become more stable, we have seen progress on free trade and more open markets, and we have seen economic growth.

It's getting better, but challenges in the region remain. Fidel Castro and Hugo Chavez remain vocal adversaries to freedom in the American values.

The arc of the universe bends toward justice, and these foes of freedom will fail in time, but the United States must continue to be the lighthouse among rocky waters. We must cooperate, educate, and assist our friends and our neighbors in Latin America. We do that best by supporting WHINSEC and the crucial work that is done there.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the McGovern amendment and let freedom ring throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a disconnect here. Let me again try to be crystal clear.

The problem is that the WHINSEC takes no responsibility for knowing anything about the human rights records of their students before they come to the U.S. or when they return home. They say the vetting process is done by the State Department, and then they say they will not, will not, do follow-up after their students return to their home countries.

How can they then claim that their training is effective? Doesn't that require some kind of follow-up or tracking of graduates? Nobody has addressed the fact that, up until just now, we would have access. There was public access to the people who went to the WHINSEC.

That's how we knew about those who violated human rights, because we had the list. This is now the response that we get from this school about the people who attend the school, not just the students, but the instructors that they

bring in. Where is the transparency? Where is the accountability? What's wrong with laying a little sunshine in?

Look, our standing around the world has never been lower. I hate to tell you something, but in Latin America this is one of the most unpopular schools that exists in the United States of America. People think that this is a school responsible for training or at least turning a blind eye to human rights violators, not just from years ago but recently.

But, then again, we really can't tell you accurately and neither can you tell me accurately what the human rights records are of these people who are attending. Because it's all blacked out. I mean, this is not the way a school in the United States that trains for our military should operate.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 6½ minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it gives me great pleasure to yield up to 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, we are speaking about today and not 1983.

I have had the opportunity, since being a Member of Congress, to work in the area of professional military education. I must tell you it's important not just for American students, American leaders, American service personnel, but it's important for our friends and allies as well.

I have nothing but great respect, great respect for my friend, my colleague from Massachusetts. I know how strongly he feels in his beliefs. But I must say that we are doing the right thing by keeping this school going and going well.

We do not teach human rights abuse. This school bestows upon its students standards. It teaches them military art. It teaches them military-to-military relationships. It also instructs in the area of human rights.

I have been to Latin America several times. Three weeks ago, I travelled again to the region with Dr. GINGREY and Mr. CONAWAY, visited Colombia and Panama. There we met with President Uribe of Colombia, President Torrijos of Panama, and other senior military and political leaders. Without exception, the leaders of those countries touted the WHINSEC program in Georgia as an exceptional opportunity for their men and women in uniform to gain not only technical knowledge but a deeper understanding of human rights.

Furthermore, spending time in the United States gives them an opportunity to learn of American values, gives them the opportunity to make friends within the American military, with whom they will undoubtedly, in days and years ahead, will have the opportunity to work.

I spoke with our American commanders in the field. They reiterated what I have heard many times before. Individuals who have been trained at WHINSEC performed better on their missions in their host country than those who have not.

Our military commanders also cherished the relationships that they have built with their Latin American counterparts who participated in the program.

In addition to comprehending our military culture and its operations, the school of graduates often are promoted and rapidly rise through the ranks. They understand what it is to have American values, and they understand about human rights which are taught there. The message from everyone was simple: Please keep that school open.

Professional military education is so important, but it's also extremely important to allow our neighbors, our friends to the south. We can't forget them to participate in the professional military education of our country.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, let me again make a point here that is that last year when we were debating this same issue, an Army officer trained at the School of the Americas murdered a DEA-trained anti-narcotics unit in Colombia. This is still happening every day.

We were told a little while ago that everything, we are referring to the distant past. Well, again, I mentioned the Bolivian ombudsman, Mr. Albarracin, who was tortured in Bolivia in 1997, and his torturer, Major Urzagaste, went to WHINSEC in 2002.

Again, I am going to keep on saying this. I don't have a problem with training foreign militaries. What I have a problem with is this: the secrecy, the lack of accountability, the lack of transparency.

I am going to tell you something. We are going to find out, sooner or later, who some of these people are; and we are going to find out that they are responsible for atrocities. I gave them an example of somebody who was admitted to the school after he had been accused of torture.

I mean, where is the vetting process? We need to do much better.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee, Mrs. LOWEY.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. For years, many Members of Congress and activists, including the Maryknoll nuns based in my congressional district, fought to shut down the School of the Americas. The school's very existence was undermining United States efforts to promote civilian control of the military and respect for human rights in Latin America.

So the Army closed the school of the Americas and reopened it a few weeks later with a new name, WHINSEC. Past questions about the School of the Americas has still not been resolved, giving us no basis on which to build a

better, more credible, effective program at WHINSEC. We need to shine the light on the past of the School of the Americas in order to put WHINSEC on track to be a beacon of light for the militaries of Latin America.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, how much additional time do I have?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from southwest Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), who also represents Muscogee County, Columbus and Fort Benning.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I represent Fort Benning; and I represent the WHINSEC, the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation. This is a fine institution. It's designed and it is functioning, created just in 2001 in response to the critique that you have heard today over and over again to promote professional education and training to eligible nations in the Western Hemisphere in democratic principles that are set forth in the charter of the Organization of American States.

You have heard all of this critique, but if you look at the bill itself that we are debating tonight, on page 65, language is put in here specifically to address these concerns. It says, "That the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations, no later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, a report addressing how the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation IMET program for fiscal year 2008 contributes to the promotion of human rights, respect for civilian authority and the rule of law, the establishment of legitimate judicial mechanisms for the military, and achieving the goal of right sizing military forces."

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for an additional minute on our side and the proponents' side so the gentleman can conclude his thoughts and we can have our last speaker.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of GEORGIA. The points that have been made and the critiques that have been made can all be addressed by the legislation written by the subcommittee, by the full committee in the bill and hopefully will be adopted by the House tonight.

□ 2015

And so I would urge the defeat of this amendment. I think that we need to proceed. We need to continue promoting democracy in our own neighborhood in the Western Hemisphere, and I think that the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation does just that, and I'd like for us to keep it and defeat this amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I don't want any more reports. What I want is accountability. I want to know whose going there. I want to know what happens to them when they go back to their country. I want to know their backgrounds before they go to the school.

You know, we knew, we found out that 19 of the 26 trigger men who murdered in cold blood six Jesuit priests in El Salvador were graduates of the school because we had access to the names. We don't have access to the names anymore. And no report is going to give us access to the names.

We want transparency. We want accountability. There are problems here. We need to address them. That's our job.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak in opposition to this amendment.

There are anecdotes for folks who have gone through this school at various stages over the last 50 years or 40 years, who have turned bad and been bad people. But there are hundreds, literally thousands, of men and women who've been trained at these schools, have gone back to their country of origin and taken with them the values that they get here, the respect for civilian authority. The human rights training that's gone on since the WHINSEC was reformulated, that is invaluable.

I've been to Colombia and Panama recently with my good colleagues, Chairman SKELTON and Dr. GINGREY and listened to the firsthand reports from the men and women who serve in our military who tell us that the men and women who are trained in this school come back to those countries better prepared to lead their country down a path that we would respect and we would want them to lead.

So I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I have great regard for the gentleman from Texas. But my question is, how do you know? Do you track all these people individually? Can you tell me that all these people whose names have been crossed out are pure, that they are following a code of human rights; that they're not guilty of atrocities against their people?

That's the point here. I'm not arguing against the U.S. being involved in training programs. What I'm saying is that there's something fundamentally wrong with a training program where everything is secret; where we're told everybody is great, but yet we can't have access to track down the people who go to that school. We need to change that.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, what is truly disingenuous is that nobody here tonight speaking against

WHINSEC, to my knowledge, has ever taken the time to visit the school.

The gentleman, the author of the amendment, my good friend, talked about transparency. It's not because folks have not been invited. WHINSEC is so proud of its operation and record on human rights that it maintains an open-door policy. And Mr. Chairman, that would be true even for the School of the Americas Watch Group. They are welcome at any time to come in and look and talk to Colonel Perez, the director of the school, and look at the curriculum. Any Member of this body can show up unannounced to see for themselves what's being taught at WHINSEC.

Those of us who've taken the time to visit understand the critical importance of engaging the leaders and the law enforcement personnel of our closest neighbors while spreading democracy and respect for human rights. We understand that unlike its predecessor, the School of the Americas, WHINSEC has a substantial human rights component that goes well beyond the training required by law.

In fact, at a recent HASC hearing, Admiral Stavridis, the Commander of Southern Command, referred to WHINSEC as the military's crown jewel for human rights training.

Mr. Chairman, as we've made clear, those who advocate cutting funding for WHINSEC do so in the absence of fact. WHINSEC has a spotless human rights record and a tremendous record of success in the Western Hemisphere.

I urge all my colleagues, please vote "no" on the McGovern amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I'm not interested in going to visit a school and having hors d'oeuvres and a cocktail.

I'm interested in who goes to the school. That's what I'm interested in. I want to follow-up who goes to the school, who's admitted to the school. And we used to be able to have access to that information. And even though the school didn't track the graduates, human rights organizations did. We are now being denied access. I mean, where's the transparency? You all talk about all the great graduates of this school. How do you know when you get this in return? This is not an open, transparent process.

Furthermore, more and more countries in Latin America are saying we don't want to have anything to do with this school. Uruguay, Bolivia, Argentina, Costa Rica have all pulled out of the school. They don't want to have anything more to do with WHINSEC.

Mr. Chairman, we've heard a great deal today that without the WHINSEC the U.S. would not be engaged in Latin America. Well, with all due respect, the U.S. trains 15,000 or more Latin American military officers and troops each and every year, less than 1,000 of them at the WHINSEC. We are very engaged in Latin American militaries, and none of these other programs carry the negative baggage that the WHINSEC does.

We have heard that WHINSEC has trained the future leaders of Latin America. But, again, with all due respect, one of Latin America's problems has been that too many of its national leaders were from the military. We should be spending our time and our efforts on strengthening civilian and democratic institutions.

We have heard assertions that that the WHINSEC is transparent and promotes democratic values. But WHINSEC's own actions show those claims to be a lie. What else do you need to see? I mean, what else do you need to see?

Now, I suggest that instead of WHINSEC, we should support the model of Argentina. After separating from the WHINSEC last year, Argentina just opened a new military school where civilian, legal and human rights experts will teach every single military officer about the role of the military in a modern democratic state.

Mr. Chair, America's reputation with the people of Latin America is at the lowest level ever. Cutting the funding for the WHINSEC will send a powerful message to the people of Latin America who, hopefully, will be the real future leaders of their nations, that the U.S. Congress finally gets it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to just close with a few personal remarks. When I was working for our dear friend and former colleague, Congressman Joe Moakley, six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper, and her 16-year old daughter were murdered in cold blood at the University of Central America in San Salvador.

It made me sick to my stomach when I learned that 19 of the 26 soldiers who murdered these priests are graduates of the School of the Americas. These priests were my friends, and I knew them. And over the years, we have raised concerns first about the School of the Americas and then its successor, the WHINSEC.

We have asked for transparency. We have called for accountability. We have asked for specific follow-up with the graduates.

Let me be perfectly clear. There's a reason why WHINSEC does not share information on its graduates and its teachers. They don't want us to do the follow-up. They don't want us to point out what they should be doing.

Passage of this amendment will send a strong signal to Latin America that we do care about human rights. But it will also send a signal to our own military that business as usual is not acceptable.

Vote "yes" on the McGovern-Lewis amendment.

LA PAZ, BOLIVIA, June 18, 2007.

DEAR HONORABLE JAMES MCGOVERN, I am writing to you in regards to the participation of police Captain Filmann Urzagaste Rodriguez in human rights violations in Bolivia, specifically in relation to his involvement in my kidnapping, detention and torture.

The events took place in January of 1997, while I held the presidential seat of the Permanent Assembly for Human Rights of Bolivia (the country's largest non governmental human rights organization). On the morning of January 25th of the aforementioned year I left my residence and hailed a taxi in direction to the University. After traveling approximately 300 meters, the taxi was intercepted by two other vehicles from which a group of men dressed in civilian clothing forced me out of the taxi and dragged me into one of the vehicles. I did not have enough time to count the number of people but I estimate the number to be between 8 to 10 men. Once in the vehicle they proceeded to cover my eyes and forced me to lie face down on the floor of the backseat. The vehicle then drove to the outside of the city, I was able to notice the difference as I felt the dust from the road hitting my face. With the vehicle in motion I was subjected to torture by my kidnappers. I could not see their faces and was unable to identify them. By their actions I concluded that the objective was to physically eliminate me or make me disappear. Nonetheless, during the terrorist operative I noticed a sudden change; I could hear an intensive exchange of communications taking place between the men in the vehicle and another source through hand held transmitters or walkie-talkies. The ve-

hicle made a sharp turn and seemed to head in a direction back towards the city. After approximately two hours I was placed in a closed room, surrounded by silence. After noticing that I couldn't hear anybody breathing close to me I removed the blindfolds and realized that I was in a police holding cell, thus concluding who had carried out the operation, there was no doubt that the police were responsible.

Sometime during the night I was taken from the cell and moved to a police administered clinic due to the lesions on my body (I could feel a few broken ribs and I was unable to move my body). Until that point, neither my family nor the other members of the Human Rights Assembly were aware of my whereabouts, but thanks to one of the doctors, whose identity I guard to this day, who was kind enough to contact them over phone on my behalf. Thanks to this information, a lot of people were informed of my whereabouts within the hour.

Under international pressure and public scrutiny, the then President of the Republic, Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada, fired the Police Chief. Nonetheless, the government protected the identities of the authors of my kidnapping due to the involvement of Minister Carlos Sanchez Berzain. This is why those responsible have not been brought to justice.

The then Captain of the Bolivian Police, Filmann Urzagaste Rodríguez, played a role in the events. This information was obtained through the Bolivian police force, given that at the time the event became public, high commanding police officers began accusing one another. Unfortunately the officer [i.e. Urzagaste] and others benefited by the impunity provided by the powers of the political sphere.

This is what I can inform in summary of this particular case.

In my condition as the current Defender of the People of Bolivia [i.e. Ombudsman] and a human rights activist I consider that the work your office has been carrying out to obtain the definitive closing of the institution formerly known as the "School of the Americas" to be of great importance. Said entity is marked by a sad and shameful history in our continent, it was there that the main protagonists and authors of some of the worst crimes against humanity executed in Latin America received instruction. I send you my support and express my unconditional solidarity in hopes that the legislative authorities of the United States attend to your request.

Sincerely,

WALDO ALBARRACIN SÁNCHEZ,
Defender of the People of Bolivia.

Last Name	2nd Last Name	First Name	Rank	Country	Course
Acevedo	De Arbaiza	Marta	1LT	El Salvador	LDR-4-2
Aleman	Molina	Eduardo	1LT	El Salvador	LDR-4-2
Bolanos	Silva	Luis	1LT	Colombia	LDR-1
Del Cid	Diaz	Francisco	COL	El Salvador	LDR-4-2
Erazo	Ojeda	Sebastian	1LT	Chile	NPME-8-3
Gomez	Dominguez	Fernando	1LT	Chile	DEV-2-6
Ramirez	Donoso	Jose	MSG	Chile	DEV-2-6
Rapiman	Cayul	Oscar	MSG	Chile	NPME-8-3
Toval	Plazas	Javier	1LT	Colombia	LDR-1-2
Acevedo	Mujica	Sebastian	MAJ	Paraguay	CMS-6
Acosta	Lara	Delis	SSG	Venezuela	NPME-8-2
Acosta	Piantini	Catalino	LTC	Dom Rep	CMS-1-2
Acosta	Nunez	Angel	CDT	El Salvador	LDR-4-2
Acosta	Mesa	Fabian	2LT	Colombia	TAC-6-2
Aduviri	Antezana	Jose	MSG	Bolivia	OJT
Aduviri	Antezana	Jose	MSG	Bolivia	DEV-2-3
Aduviri	Antezana	Jose	MSG	Bolivia	NPME-8-2
Aguero	Alder	Pastor	MAJ	Paraguay	CMS-7
Aguerre	Gutierrez	Jorge	PV2	Colombia	TAC-8-2
Aguilar	Rojas	Martin	SSG	Panama	TAC-6-2
Aguilar	S.	Patricio	CPT	Ecuador	TAC-2
Aguilar	Valverde	Juan	CPT	Costa Rica	DEV-2-4
Aguilar	Manzano	Eduardo	PFC	Chile	DEV-2-6
Aguilera	Argueta	Ronald	CDT	El Salvador	LDR-4-2
Aguilera	Miranda	Pablo	PFC	Chile	DEV-2-6
Aguirre	Stoaminga	Edgar	SPC	Ecuador	TAC-6-2
Alarcon	Mirand	Pablo	SGT	Chile	NPME-8-2
Alarcon	Bustos	Jose	PFC	Chile	NPME-8
Alas	Luquez	Hector	MAJ	El Salvador	OPME-5
Albarracin		Antonio	SGT	Colombia	NPME-8-2
Alcantara	Silva	Pablo	CPT	Mexico	CMS-6
Aleman	Sanchez	Llery	2LT	Honduras	LDR-4
Alfonso	Forero	Javier	CDT	Colombia	LDR-1-2
Aliaga	Llantoy	Henry	SSG	Peru	NPME-8-3
Almeida		Jaime	LTC	Ecuador	CMS-5-6
Altamirano		Gabriel	SGT	Ecuador	TAC-6-2
Alturo	Quintero	Alexadner	SGT	Colombia	NPME-8-2
Alvarez	Buitrago	German	1LT	Colombia	CMS-5-8
Alvarez	Ochoa	Javier	MAJ	Colombia	OPME-5
Alvarez	Vejar	Jorge	SGT	Chile	NPME-8-2
Alvarez		Pablo	SGT	Uruguay	TAC-7
Alvarez	Palacio	Rodrigo	2LT	Honduras	LDR-4
Amarista		Victor	SFC	Venezuela	NPME-8-2
Amaya	Gomez	Jose	CDT	El Salvador	LDR-4-2

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK).

Mr. SESTAK. With great respect to the Representative from Massachusetts, I'd be remiss not to say the following:

I have seen in 31 years in our military, us be resisted throughout this world for the power of our economy and the power of our military. But I've watched us be admired for the power of our ideals. And the story I'm about to tell I saw many times over.

In command of a small ship, I pulled into a country. A young officer got underway with us. As we pulled back in, after an overnight, he said Captain, you treat your men, enlisted men, different than we do. I said, what do you mean? He said, you treat them as though they're equal to you. I said, they say yes, sir or no, sir. He said, no, you treat them as though they're equal human beings. We don't.

My only comment is, I have seen that so many times, that that picture of a GI with the candy bar is true. We do make mistakes.

But I truly ask, don't close this school. Improve it. It has made mistakes. It is needed for engagement of a good men and women in a good military to show the ideals of our country.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, if I may, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to just yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, once you sift through the mountain of misinformation presented on the floor tonight, it's clear that those who advocate cutting funding from WHINSEC do so, as I say, in the absence of fact. WHINSEC is not the School of the

Americas. WHINSEC has a spotless human rights record and is exceeding in helping the United States develop critical relationships with our closer neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, in fact, it is time to let the School of the Americas go, and to give WHINSEC a chance.

And so I urge all my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I move to strike the last word, and I'm pleased to yield to my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia, their record isn't spotless. We presented five cases last year. I mean, maybe you weren't listening to the debate, but we did. And the problem with this year is this is what the WHINSEC gave us, so we can't follow up.

And to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who I have great respect for, you know, I'm not against military training. And yeah, we need to do better. My amendment, by the way, doesn't cut off all funding for the WHINSEC. Most of that money is in the Defense bill. It only cuts off the money that is under the jurisdiction of this bill.

And yes, it does need to be improved. I don't know how anybody can vote against this amendment in light of the fact that this is their, WHINSEC's, example of transparency. How do we follow up on the graduates? How can we follow up on whether the people that are going there are human rights abusers when we get this in return?

Even under the infamous School of the Americas, we were given the names. That's how I found out that 19 of the 22 trigger men who murdered the Jesuit priests were graduates of the School of Americas. If I got this I never would have known that. This is what they have given us.

Now, this is not transparency. This is not accountability. You want that school to do better, we need to send a message on the floor of the House today that we're not satisfied with business as usual, and the way to do that is vote for the McGovern amendment.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for the McGovern-Lewis amendment. Let's take a stand for human rights. If this country stands for anything, it needs to stand out loud and four square for human rights, and this is one way to prove it. Vote for this amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the McGovern-Lewis amendment.

This important amendment will prohibit funding to the infamous Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) formerly known as the School of the Americas.

We all know the history of this Institute that has long been associated with human rights abuses and many of its students have been tied to death squads and international coups.

Despite assurances to the contrary by supporters of the WHINSEC, the continuing legacy of blood and terror by these graduates calls into question how these candidates are recruited and vetted.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when our occupation of Iraq has greatly damaged our credibility and standing in the world, the last thing we need to be doing is funding an organization like WHINSEC that is drenched in a legacy of secrecy, terror, and violence.

I urge my colleagues to support the McGovern-Lewis amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:
At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of State as a contribution for the United Nations Human Rights Council.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007 the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking the gentlelady from New York, the chair of the subcommittee, Ms. LOWEY, and my dear friend from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, for agreeing to accept this amendment and for their support and their leadership on this and other human rights issues.

I also want to recognize my good friends, my esteemed colleagues who joined me in offering this amendment: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MCCAUL, and Judge POE.

This amendment makes clear that the United States will not spend millions of U.S. taxpayer dollars to support the travesty of the U.N. Human Rights Council, more appropriately named the Human Wrongs Council. It does not cut off U.S. contributions to the U.N. regular budget, but actually prohibits them from being used to support the Council in any way.

Two days ago the so-called U.N. Human Rights Council celebrated its first birthday by giving gifts to repressive dictators and Islamic radicals, by halting unfinished investigations into human rights conditions in Cuba and Belarus, and creating a permanent agenda item relating to Israel.

The actions against Israel took place as news reports documented the hor-

rific actions by Hamas against innocent Palestinians, including those in Gaza clamoring to enter Israel. The Council has been fatally flawed from its inception in the year 2006, and has proven even more problematic than the already discredited U.N. Human Rights Commission that it was designated to replace.

□ 2030

Instead of becoming part of the solution, Mr. Chairman, the United Nations Human Rights Council continues to perpetuate intolerance, serving as a forum for hateful attacks against Israel by some of the worst violators of human rights.

To cite just one of many examples, the Iranian representative to the Human Rights Council stated on December 12 of last year: "There is an Israeli holocaust against Palestinian people here on a daily basis for more than 60 years, which was already noted by three special sessions." This is a human rights activist?

In contrast, the Council has failed to condemn the genocide in Darfur, has failed to condemn the sprawling gulag in North Korea, has failed to condemn the political and human rights daily abuses in China and the bloody repression in Burma and Zimbabwe.

Simply put, the U.N. Human Rights Council is a failure. We were right to refuse to dignify this poisonous talkshop with our membership, and we must refuse to support it with our tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), who has taken for many years a leadership substance on this issue.

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

And I think her comment about the "human wrong commission" is appropriate, and I think that is a very apt way to explain it. When you talk about all the work they did, and she mentioned Darfur, that the Human Rights Council of the U.N. was unable to even pass a simple resolution dealing with it, that is unbelievable.

But where did they spend most of their time? That is a good question we could ask. Do you know where they spent most of their time? Condemning Israel. The Council's sole country-specific resolution censured Israel and adopted a decision to discuss human rights violations committed by Israel in the Palestinian territories permanently and in all the Council's meetings. Every Council meeting would discuss Israel's alleged abuses against Palestinians, without mentioning Palestinian provocations or their aggression. It is just unbelievable. In fact, the Council adopted a resolution that strongly condemned Israel for "violations of human rights and breaches of

international humanitarian law in Lebanon." In Lebanon, without reference to provocations by Hezbollah. Talk about a "human wrong commission." This is it.

So I am so gratified that this amendment has been accepted. I have a bill, H.R. 225, that outlines this amendment. I had an amendment last year on this subject in this appropriations process. We got 163 votes. But we lost. And I think a lot of people said, well, the U.N. is starting reforms in house. Let's give it a chance with its Human Rights Council. So we said, okay, we'll give it a chance. But, by all assessment it failed. In fact, the words of Peggy Hicks, the global advocacy director of Human Rights Watch, sums it up when she said: "The new Human Rights Council must be more than the dysfunctional old commission by another name."

So from that, to the comment of the Miami Herald when they wrote, "Why should these wolves guard the hen house?"

I ask that we pass this amendment, and I thank my colleagues.

Take the so-called reforms to the membership of the council. The original proposal by the former Secretary General Annan (AH-NON) was to reduce membership to enable the council to be smaller and more agile in acting against human rights offenses. Indeed, the UN did reduce the number of members—from 53 down to 47. These 47 UN members are elected to three-year terms on the UNHRC. The new geographic quota system ensures a majority of membership slots for the world's least democratic regions. The African and Asian regional groups control a 55% majority—even more than they did on the former commission. Governments that routinely violate fundamental freedoms in their own countries shouldn't be setting the standards for anyone else.

Under the new council, a country can be suspended from council membership due to continuing human rights abuses only if two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly agree to do so. That is the only protection against human rights abusers being elected to the council. However, in practice this provision is useless. Less than half of the General Assembly agreed that Sudan is guilty of any human rights violations. If the General Assembly cannot agree on such a blatantly clear cut case of human rights abuse, how can we expect them to agree on suspending membership of countries that are human rights? The answer is, we can't. Known abusers like Russia, China, Azerbaijan, Cuba, and Algeria were all elected members this last session.

Finally, let us look at their actions. Under a General Assembly resolution, the Council has responsibility for "promoting universal respect for the protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction of any kind and in a fair and equal manner" and it must "address situations of violations of human rights, including gross and systematic violations, and make recommendations thereon." There have been several opportunities for the Council to act with numerous cases of human rights abuses around the world. In Darfur, there are 2.5 million people displaced by the violence, 385,000 people in immediate

risk of starvation, and over two million dead in the 22 years of violence. But the Human Rights Council was unable to pass a resolution on Darfur. Neither did it act regarding the lack of civil and political rights across China, the 13 million women in Saudi Arabia who live in fear of beatings if they go anywhere alone, or the dire human-rights conditions of 23 million people in North Korea. It also failed to address the Iranian President's incitement to genocide or the fact that his country's legal system includes crucifixion, stoning and amputation as viable punishments.

Ambassador Bolton stated at the creation of the new council, "We want a butterfly. We're not going to put lipstick on a caterpillar and declare it a success." As a result, the Administration announced that it would not seek a seat on the council in 2006 but would continue financial support, and may seek membership in 2007 if the Council proves effective.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I agree with the intention of the amendment and thank my friend for raising this very important issue.

I want to reiterate my support for the United Nations. I strongly believe in the mission of the United Nations. That plays an indispensable role in the world today. In fact, it has often been said that if the United Nations did not already exist, we would surely need to invent it.

The U.N. plays an important role in maintaining international peace and security, promoting economic and social development, alleviating hunger, championing human rights, and supporting efforts to address humanitarian crises.

However, the U.N. is by no means perfect. It is often too slow to act in times of crisis, and too often the U.N. is a reflection of the lowest common denominator, rather than the best and the brightest.

A perfect example of the problems with the U.N. is the Human Rights Council. My friend and I agree that there are problems, and I want to assure my friend that as we move toward conference that we will ensure that none of the funds in the CIO account will go toward paying the costs of the United Nations Human Rights Council.

And, again, I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield to my friend (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to particularly thank our subcommittee chairman, NITA LOWEY. I think she has done a remarkable job throughout the day and during her entire service in the United States Congress.

And to my good friend ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, I want to thank her for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to put an end to the shenanigans at the United Nations. While murderous and dictatorial regimes in North Korea, Zimbabwe, and Sudan have starved and burned and raped and killed hundreds of thousands of their own countrymen, the United Nations Human Rights Council focuses its attention on the

only democratic country in the Middle East: Israel. Israel, with a free press, a country with free elections, a vibrant economy, and an open society; a nation that has to defend itself from terrorists and terrorism, terrorists who would wipe it from the face of the Earth if they had half a chance. Now that is a human rights issue worth looking into.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations' Orwellian hypocrisy on human rights is so well known it has become a cliché. This body must take a stand against this mockery of a Human Rights Council. Let us cut off funding for this shameful and outrageous organization.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POE:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide an immigrant or nonimmigrant visa to a national or citizen of a country with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations and the central government of which has notified the Secretary of State of its refusal to extradite to the United States any individual indicted in the United States for killing a law enforcement officer, as specified in a United States extradition request.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, as a former prosecutor and felony court judge in Texas, I tried a lot of cases where the victims of homicide were peace officers. Like any victim, these officers came from all ages and all races. The murder of a peace officer is one of the most serious crimes that can occur in any community.

Unlike other victims, Mr. Chairman, peace officers carry the daily burden of protecting their communities from crime, everything from petty theft to the most violent and vicious of crimes. Every day these defenders of our cities put their lives on the line. They have asked to be in harm's way, and then when one is killed in the line of duty, their loss is deeply felt by the entire community.

There are cases, however, when peace officers are killed and their killers happen to be immigrants from foreign countries, some legal immigrants, some illegal. And there are many cases where the home countries of these immigrants refuse to send them back to the United States to face their charges

once they are requested to be extradited to the United States from their home country.

In 2002, a Los Angeles County sheriff was murdered by a Mexican citizen who was illegally in the country. However, the Mexican government refused for 5 years to extradite him to the United States to stand trial, and it only occurred this January when the charge was reduced.

The same occurred in Denver in 2005 when a police officer by the name of Donnie Young was murdered, and only after the charges were reduced was the killer extradited back to this country.

Killing police officers seems to also be a popular pastime for a few immigrants in Texas. In my hometown, a Houston police officer by the name of Rodney Johnson was shot four times and killed by an illegal immigrant in September of 2006. In fact, the last three law enforcement officers shot in Harris County, Texas, were shot by people who were illegally here in the United States.

Fortunately, each of these killers were captured before they fled to their home country, and they will have their day in court. But what about the ones that don't get caught and flee to some other country? This problem is only increasing in States that border Mexico, where travel across the border is easy; and now violent drug cartels rule the area and certainly have no qualms about shooting at American peace officers.

So this country should not be spending money toward admitting immigrants to the United States from any country that refuses to allow the United States to try police killers by harboring those killers in their country.

I ask my fellow Members of Congress to join me, along with the Fraternal Order of Police that has endorsed this amendment, to support limiting funds in this bill to be used for issuing visas to nationals or citizens of countries that have notified our State Department of their refusal to extradite to the United States an individual indicted for killing a peace officer in this country. We owe this to our peace officers and their families.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express reservations regarding the gentleman's amendment.

I do share his deep concern over the refusal of certain countries to extradite to the United States any individual indicted in the United States for killing a law enforcement officer. I certainly do not condone the refusal of those governments to extradite those accused of murdering a law enforcement officer in order to allow the families of fallen law enforcement officers to see the person or persons involved face justice.

However, the remedy that the gentleman is proposing is not targeted at

the central government but at all persons from those countries applying for a visa. I just have some reservations about punishing the people of a country because their government is doing something objectionable that goes against the way we would like to be seen in the world.

But I am prepared to accept the amendment and bring this matter to conference.

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I understand the chairman's concerns about this amendment, but it will be an effort to, of course, get those people back in the United States who are charged with the specific crime of killing a peace officer.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I know it has been accepted, but this is an important amendment. My father was a policeman for 20 years in the city of Philadelphia.

If a country isn't prepared to send somebody back, then we ought to do what the gentleman from Texas said. We ought to deny them the visa. And I will push for this when we get to conference. I think this is a good amendment.

We just can't go to all these meetings and say we love our police officers and we honor them and then all of a sudden we walk away from them. The gentleman is exactly right. Let's pass this. I appreciate its being accepted. But I think we ought to pass it because they think we are a patsy.

We also had a young man in my district who was run over and killed around Christmastime. And the guy left and went back to El Salvador, and that family hurts, are in pain every day, and they can't get this guy back. So I think if there is any deficiency in it, it probably ought to cover every felon but at least peace officers.

So it is a good amendment, and it has been accepted. But, frankly, I think we should have asked for a roll call vote to get every Member on record for it. But since it has been accepted, let's keep it in the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BLUNT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLUNT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the International Seabed Authority or the Enterprise of the International Seabed Authority.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June, 20, 2007, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, nearly 25 years ago, President Ronald Reagan was given the option of signing what was at that time a little-known international treaty promising to bring the world's countries together to seamlessly and equitably manage the vast expanses of ocean covering the Earth.

That accord, all 17 parts, 320 articles, and 9 annexes of it, was known the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It was presented to the President as a key national security imperative, an important economic opportunity, and a powerful message of cooperation and trust to send to our current and future friends around the globe.

Mr. Chairman, it didn't take President Reagan more than a few days to separate the rhetoric from the reality. He rightly interpreted the Law of the Sea Treaty, LOST, as a direct affront to American sovereignty and envisioned, presciently, as it turned out, that it might some day be used as a tool by foreign governments to exercise direct authority over American interests, activities, and industries.

□ 2045

President Reagan not only refused to sign the treaty, he fired the staffers that were responsible for negotiating it in the first place.

More than a generation later, there is talk in the U.S. Senate that they may dust off this stale treaty once again and bring it to a vote. Before it does, I believe this House has an obligation to take a close look at one element of this accord, which will impact the way American companies invest in new technology, it will impede their ability to produce new energy, and has long-range implications.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have at the desk tonight will ensure that none of the funds spent in the State and Foreign Operations budget are used to support what's called the International Seabed Authority. It's a semi-autonomous, unelected body of the United Nations with authority to directly levy taxes and fines against American operators with or without their approval. Worse still, it would have the power to force a direct transfer of minerals and technology rights from the American companies that develop them to any competitor it sees fit.

The Treaty's collision course with autonomous American Government is obvious, Mr. Chairman; the Seabed Authority is not only an obvious and very direct example of a U.N. effort to raise revenue without the input of the United States Government, but the Authority would also disincentivize private investment in offshore energy exploration which, in our current energy climate, is something this Congress should be working to avoid at all costs.

We need all the energy we can get, whenever and wherever we find it. Submitting ourselves to an unelected, unaccountable, international ocean bureaucracy when it comes to distributing what American companies rightly explore doesn't strike me as the thing to do 25 years ago or today.

Tonight, Mr. Chairman, I've come to the floor to ask my colleagues to consider the implications of ceding unprecedented authority to an agency of the U.N. without proper oversight, without legitimate safeguards, and without a whole lot of concern about the economic and security well-being of the United States.

I urge adoption of this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I rise to accept the amendment, and I thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentlelady for accepting, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 26 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$2,956,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I don't pretend to know exactly how the billions of dollars in the Foreign Operations bill should be exactly split up and allocated, that's the work of the committee. And I appreciate the work of the Chair, the ranking member and those Members of the Congress who are part of that important committee.

What I do understand is this: Government spends too much money. In fact, if you would talk to the American people, go out and poll the American people, talk to the families across this country and ask the simple question, does government spend too little or does government spend too much, is government too small or is government too big, does government take too

much of your money in taxes, my guess is the vast majority of Americans across this country would say government is too big, takes way too much of my money and spends way too much.

This amendment simply says this: We're not going to cut anything. We're just going to say it's appropriate for government to live on last year's level, just like all kinds of individuals, all kinds of families, all kinds of businesses across this country have to do.

Specifically it would do this: It would reduce the total appropriations in the bill by \$2.9 billion, taking it right back, keeping it right where it is at last year's spending level, while providing discretion for the administration to avoid any reductions in funding for the State of Israel. In simple terms it says this: We understand that special bond that the United States has with the State of Israel, and we're going to protect that; but we also understand government spends too much money, and it's appropriate that we say enough is enough, we have to hold the line on spending.

And here's why it's critical: There is a financial crisis around the corner waiting for the United States, the people of this great country. Read Pete Peterson's book, "Running on Empty," talking about the entitlement problems, what's happening with us, if we don't get spending under control, what it's going to mean to our economy in the future.

Read today's Washington Post, front page of the business section, the entitlement column has pictures of the six leading Presidential candidates, three from each party. It says, "Stumping for Attention to Deficit Disorder." It talks about this very problem.

There is a financial crisis around the corner that we have to deal with. It's important we start now by simply saying let's hold the line.

Second big thing why this is so important. Spending inevitably leads to tax increases. Spend, spend, spend leads to tax, tax, tax. The American people are overtaxed, we don't want to tax them anymore. In fact, we need to lower taxes so we can compete in the international marketplace we're in right now.

We've got to deal with the financial situation that confronts us. We've got to hold taxes down. That's why it's important for us to start here and simply say we're going to hold the line on spending. Millions of families, millions of individuals, millions of businesses across this country are doing that very thing. It's not too much to ask the United States Congress to do the same thing.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is fiscally irresponsible, it will harm our national security, and I strongly oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the minority whip,

the gentleman from the great State of Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This amendment is really another test of the Congress' commitment to fiscal discipline.

Today we're considering a State and Foreign Operations bill that is close to another record increase. I think it is below the President's number, but I've voted on a number of bills over the last several years that were below the President's number. And the fact is the President's number was too high, 9½ percent increase over last year's spending is too high. We can cut more than that, we can cut back to last year's spending, we can cut a percent, we can cut 2 percent, we can cut, go maybe even below last year's spending, but 9½ percent over last year's spending is too much money for this bill at this time.

Not very many American families saw an increase last year of 9½ percent. First, you have to figure out where these massive increases are going. Fourteen and 15 percent increases for the U.S. Agency for International Development, \$203 million, or a 17.6 percent, increase for the United States contribution to various international organizations.

Second, you have to look at where this wasteful spending is going. We're funding things in this bill at increased levels like the International Copper Study Group in Lisbon, Portugal; the International Lead and Zinc Study Group at Lisbon, Portugal; the International Hydrographic Organization at Monte Carlo; the International Rubber Study Group in London, England; the International Tropical Timber Organization at Yokohama, Japan. A 9½ percent increase in a budget that American families will pay for, where not very many American families got a 9½ percent increase.

We're going to have some legitimate debates about increases on spending in this country. I think increases on spending in other countries at this level are unacceptable. This is an important debate to have, it's an important vote to have. I encourage the gentleman to continue to make these kinds of principled stands.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I don't plan to use all of the 2 minutes.

This amendment jeopardizes greatly the national security of the United States. It devastates program increases in key diplomatic functions that the Secretary of State has requested, in particular in the State Department.

This bill is already \$700 million below the President of the United States' request. And for the gentleman to offer an amendment to cut this bill \$2.9 billion across the board has profound implications for the committee product.

I would encourage Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to reject this amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this bill increases funding in the Foreign Operations bill to foreign countries almost at 10 percent. And as already stated, most Americans did not get a 10 percent increase in their income last year, but yet we are going to spend money in foreign countries. And much of this money is waste, total waste that Americans should not be funding at all. It gives money also to nations that constantly and consistently vote against us in the United Nations.

It's important to note, however, none of this funding decrease will affect aid to our strongest ally to the Middle East, Israel; money that is well spent for the security of not only Israel, but the United States.

So, increasing funding in this Foreign Operations bill is not acceptable. All we're doing in the gentleman from Ohio's amendment is to put in it at last year's level, and that's a good idea.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to talk about an amendment that I would have offered but won't do so because I understand it's subject to a point of order.

Pakistan is scheduled to have crucial parliamentary elections in the fall of 2007 and the early winter of 2008. My amendment would withhold a portion of military aid to Pakistan unless those elections occurred and were free, fair and democratic.

Specifically, the amendment would have withheld \$175 million out of a total of \$250 million that's allocated under this bill for foreign military financing in Pakistan. These funds would be released when the Secretary of State determined, giving due consideration to the credible, independent judgment of reliable agencies that elections in Pakistan were free, fair and democratic. The amendment also asks that all steps of the election process, from voter registration on through vote tabulation, be reviewed in reaching any such judgment.

This amendment would send a powerful message to the people of Pakistan about the importance the United States places on the democratic process. Instead of just talking about the importance of democracy and saying that all peoples of the world should have these rights, the amendment quite literally would give Congress a chance to act consistently with its word.

Since the coup in which he rose to power 8 years ago, President Musharraf has taken some positive steps, but his record is, at best, mixed, especially recently. Today, President Musharraf is

fighting the most serious challenge to his 8-year dictatorship. The United States is supporting him fully, and I guess that means that the message from the United States to the Pakistani public would seem clear: The Bush administration sees the war on terrorism as topping everything, even support for democracy.

On March 9, President Musharraf suspended Iftikhar Mohammed Chaudhry, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who was apparently seen as threatening to President Musharraf's plans to consolidate his power. That triggered street protests demanding Musharraf's resignation, followed by a government-led crackdown on lawyers, the opposition political parties, and the media. Thousands of lawyers nationwide have led marches joined by women's groups, journalists and opposition politicians.

The roots of this crisis go back to a blind bargain that Washington made after 9/11 with a general and the army that had, up until then, been the main patrons of the Taliban. The administration ignored Musharraf's despotism in return for his promises to crack down on al Qaeda and the Taliban. Now, despite \$10 billion in U.S. aid to Pakistan since 2001, that deal is shattered.

In December of 2005, the 9/11 Commission's Public Discourse Project issued a report card noting that Musharraf has made efforts to take on the threat of extremism, but has not shut down extremist-linked madrassas or terrorist camps.

Taliban forces still pass freely across the Pakistan-Afghani border and operate in Pakistani tribal areas. These border groups gained political legitimacy last year when President Musharraf signed a series of dubious peace deals with the Pakistan Taliban.

Extremist madrassas remain, and the extremism only becomes more pervasive and dangerous. Madrassa students are burning books, CDs and DVDs. Women in Islamabad have had acid doused in their faces for their failure to wear burkas, and have been harassed for driving cars.

The military has refused to put a brake on their extremism. As terrorism author Ahmed Rashid said, Musharraf promised the international community that he would purge pro-Taliban elements from his security service and convinced the Bush administration that his philosophy of "enlightened moderation" was the only way to fend off Islamic extremism, but Pakistan today is still the center of global Islamic terrorism. Our own State Department concluded the same thing several weeks ago.

Mr. Rashid is correct in saying that instead of confronting this threat, the army has focused on keeping Musharraf in power. In trying to spook the West into continuing to support him, he exaggerates grossly the strength of the Islamic parties and warns that they might take over his nuclear-armed country.

□ 2100

Mr. Chairman, the fact is the United States would be far safer if we supported a truly representative Pakistan government that could marginalize the Jihadists rather than placing all of its eggs in a Musharraf basket. A better outcome for all would be that everybody participate in free and fair elections, and we should act in favor of democracy with those policies.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his willingness to withdraw the amendment. I know we'll work together on these very important issues. The discussion certainly will continue between this Congress and the administration as we move forward. I thank the gentleman again for withdrawing.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I will just say I appreciate the gentleman's speech and his passion, even though it had nothing to do with the subject at hand.

Mr. Chairman, I would yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS).

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my friend from Ohio for yielding.

It is interesting as I hear this debate, I am a new Member of Congress. I have been here 6 months now. I've heard speakers on the majority side talk about "your amendment is irresponsible." I have a hard time understanding that.

Quite frankly, coming from Tennessee, holding the line on spending is not irresponsible. I heard another speaker talk about cuts. Well, actually there is no cut. What your amendment actually does is hold it at the levels of last year's spending. That is not a cut.

I have not gotten used to "Washington speak" yet, coming from the mountains in East Tennessee. In East Tennessee, a cut actually means you spend less money this year than you did last year. Your amendment says you're going to spend the same amount of money. We are talking about \$34.2 billion. In East Tennessee, that is a lot of money. That goes a long way.

Actually, what we are looking at in this appropriation bill is a 9.5 percent increase in spending. When the rate of inflation is less than 3 percent, this is a growth in spending of almost three to four times the rate of inflation.

We have men and women all around America right now sitting at their kitchen tables trying to decide how they are going to balance their budgets. Why in the world are we in Congress trying to grow our budgets almost 10 percent when we have people across America that are trying to just balance their budget? Gas prices are high. They are worried about increases in taxes.

The least we can do, the very least we can do, is just hold the line on spending. That is not a cut. That is not how I learned about cuts back in East Tennessee.

I just hope that we will do everything we can to support your budget. I encourage support of your amendment. I encourage my colleagues to do so. Still, we are looking at, again, \$34.2 billion. I think that is enough spending. We need to hold the line. Thank you for your amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I notice as I walk down the halls of the House office buildings these easels and these poster boards, I have been seeing those for last 3 or 4 years, talking about the national debt and what percentage of it is attributed to every man, woman and child in this country. I think that national debt is something like \$8.77 trillion now. It is \$29,000 for each man, woman and child.

Well, the Democrats have come with these 11 spending bills, Mr. Chairman, to increase that spending an additional \$23 billion. If my math is correct, then that raises the amount of debt for every man, woman and child in this country from \$29,000 to \$30,000.

But wait just a second, Mr. Chairman. The way they are going to avert that is, you guessed it, raising taxes. They are going to put the largest tax increase in United States history on the backs of the American people. That is why the gentleman from Ohio has such a good amendment, to just simply say, let's go back to 2007 levels.

Our hardworking men and women in this country, many of them, if not most of them, during this past year probably got no raise. Their cost of living went up. It didn't go down. So they are in a negative situation.

Let's not make the matter worse by putting additional tax burden on the backs of the American people.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the gentleman that this bill is \$700 million below the President's request. We all understand that the Nation is at war. We have tremendous challenges. This bill provides important resources to address these challenges internationally. It is absolutely irresponsible, in my judgment. It is not in the national security interests of the United States of America. I strongly oppose this irresponsible amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$342,430,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to offer this amendment. This amendment is what is affectionately referred to as the Hefley amendment. Former Congressman Hefley, who served in this body, offered an across-the-board decrease in spending in appropriations bills by 1 percent in an effort to try to bring about some fiscal responsibilities. I commend him at this time.

I also want to recognize Congresswoman BLACKBURN, Congressman HENSARLING, Congressman FEENEY and Congressman CAMPBELL for also offering similar amendments and commend them for their fiscal responsibility.

There has been a lot of talk about money, and properly so, during this appropriation season. It is important, Mr. Chairman, however, to remember where that money comes from. That money comes from hardworking American taxpayers. It is their money. It is not the government's money. It is their money. It is easy here in Washington to lose sight of that fact.

□ 2115

But it is imperative that we remember with great responsibility and act with great reason as we move and spend the hard working American taxpayers' money.

The big picture in this bill is that last year in this area of the Federal budget we spent as a Nation \$31.2 billion. That is with a B, Mr. Chairman, \$31.2 billion. The proposal today is to spend \$34.2 billion. That is an increase of 9.5 percent. This amendment would decrease that by 1 percent. By 1 percent. One penny out of every dollar savings for the American people. A savings of \$342 million.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is a small step, a symbolic step but is an important step, to let the American people know that, yes, we do believe that we respect the hard work that they do, and we also believe that it is important for Washington to get its fiscal house in order.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. I am pleased to have the support of so many of my colleagues in this House on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Now is exactly the wrong time to cut funding for foreign assistance programs. This is not the way to balance the budget. Instead of an overall cut, we should work to decrease instability worldwide and address the underlying problems that cause that instability.

The programs in this bill are pivotal to winning back the hearts and minds overseas. They address the most difficult problems in the world today, HIV-AIDS, famine, disease and disasters. The bill includes programs that work to address the root causes of global instability that require us to devote so many of our tax dollars to failed and failing states to ensure that we protect our Nation. It is these problems that have gotten us into the disastrous deficit that we are in and it is these problems that the programs in this bill will address.

This bill is a carefully crafted, bipartisan measure. It is currently \$700 million below the President's request. We have already cut enough from these important foreign assistance programs, and this amendment would cut an additional \$324 million.

Think about the most vulnerable and susceptible among us. This amendment would take \$51 million from addressing global HIV-AIDS. Our goal is to turn the tide on this horrendous pandemic, not turn our backs. This bill currently has the funding to ramp up treatment, care and prevention activities. We can't turn around now.

I strongly oppose this irresponsible amendment. It is not consistent with our national security. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those comments. However, only in Washington by this majority party can a cut be an actual increase of \$2.56 billion. Adopting this amendment would result in an increase of \$2.56 billion. It is just a decrease in the slope of the increase.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding and I thank him for his leadership.

Again, how amazing. What an amazing place this is, when you are debating whether or not you are going to increase something called Foreign Operations 9.5 percent versus 8.5 percent growth, and somehow that is called a cut. Only in Washington, D.C. can you call an 8.5 percent increase a cut.

Now, the only thing that I see that is being cut is the family budget of hard

working American families as our friends on the other side of the aisle want to enact the single largest tax increase in American history. The average family in America, when this tax increase plan is complete, will have to pay an extra \$3,000 a year in taxes. Mr. Chairman, that is a cut.

Mr. Chairman, somehow I have heard that this amendment, the gentleman from Georgia is irresponsible for offering such an amendment. People who work hard for their paychecks in America would be lucky to have an 8.5 percent increase.

We are dealing with Foreign Operations here. Maybe we ought to be thinking about family budget operations. Already the Federal Government is spending \$23,289 per American family. Our friends on the other side of the aisle now, as we are debating this appropriation bill, have a plan to spend an extra \$23 billion in non-defense discretionary, on top of the \$6 billion in the omnibus, on top of the \$17 billion in the war supplemental, all to be paid for by the single largest tax increase in history. And it is irresponsible to only increase Foreign Operations 8.5 percent?

Let's protect the family budget from the Federal budget and support this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I rise in strong support of this bill and in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very important the RECORD be clear about this endless rhetoric about tax increases. Here are the facts: The budget resolution that was adopted by the House does not raise taxes in this fiscal year or the next on anyone.

When the tax cuts that the erstwhile majority enacted expire at the end of 2009, our budget resolution calls for us to look at the state of the economy, the state of the budget and the state of the situation, and, unlike the erstwhile majority, make a choice as to what to do. There is no tax increase in this fiscal year or the next one.

What there is in this amendment is a strange sense of irresponsibility, that in a world where we are threatened by all kinds of threats and difficult problems, in a budget that is going to spend less than 1.5 percent out of every dollar we spend in improving our relations with countries around the world, that we have an irresponsible proposal like this.

There is no tax increase this year. This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, here we are tonight, 6 months under control of the Democrat majority, and what has that majority wrought? The largest tax increase in U.S. history, an attempt in the past to change the rules of the House that have been in place since the times of Jefferson. And, of course, last week we saw the creation or attempted creation of slush funds to conceal where they wish to spend their increase of dollars.

The gentleman from New Jersey who just spoke a moment ago said, quite candidly, that there is no tax increase this year or next year. What he didn't finish in his statement, of course, was, Mr. Chairman, that there will be a tax increase within the budget cycle that is before us.

And these are not just my words, Mr. Chairman. I quote from the New York Times, who has looked at the budget that the Democrats have given us, and they have looked at that budget increase and the spending increase, and they too have said and agree with us that there is a tax increase coming on the American public and they even gave us numbers. If you are an average family in the State of New Jersey, a family of four making \$70,000, you will see a tax increase of upwards to \$1,500 on you because of the budget of Democrats who are now in charge.

In the bill before us, I come to the floor right now to commend the gentleman for his modest proposal to simply reduce the increase by the Democrats of 1 percent, a mere, in terms of Washington, \$342 million.

Mr. Chairman, we are still looking at an increase in spending for foreign aid of almost 10 percent, around an 8.5 percent increase for foreign aid. Quite honestly, when I go back to my districts and talk to my constituents, their interest is in their families here at home, in Sussex County, Bergen County, Passaic County and Warren County in the good State of New Jersey. They are asking, why are we increasing to such a dramatic extent for all this money on foreign aid when we have problems right here at home?

Mr. Chairman, how many times have you heard from the other side of the aisle when they rail against spending for our brave men and women overseas on our military aid, when they say we should be spending those dollars here at home? We concur when it comes to foreign aid, we should direct those funds here at home.

I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) to shed some light on the misinformation that we have been hearing this evening about tax increases.

It seems to me, Mr. JACKSON, that we have this huge deficit that has been brought about by the Republican majority in the past 10 years, at least. Would you like to comment on it for 3 minutes?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

While talking about how we arrived at this deficit for new Members who are joining the body can be long and drawn out, but the number of tax decreases that we have voted on in this Congress under their leadership which greatly contributed to the enormous deficit that we presently confront, it would require several hours of discussion and probably pull some scabs off of some wounds that aren't worthy of discussion.

I do want to talk about the implications, however, of this particular cut on this bill.

This bill is already \$700 million beneath the President's request. The last I checked, the President of the United States is not from the majority party. The President of the United States is from the minority party. He is already suggesting that the bill itself is beneath the funding levels that he is requesting for the national security of the United States.

But don't believe me. Believe the ranking member of the committee, Mr. WOLF, who said last night that he believes this is a good bill, that this bill has the potential to do a lot of good.

I quote him: "And I want to say that this bill will help save a lot of lives, not only here but around the world. This is the work of the Lord. And I know Members are going to come down here, and here they come, and they are going to be against this bill. And I hope that we can change some of the things to prevent a veto. But this bill eventually, when it passes," as the ranking member said, "assuming it will be vetoed, is really about feeding the poor, about the hungry, the naked and the sick. Almost a better title would be the Matthew 25 bill. So it is has the potential to do a lot of good, and I hope to work with Chairwoman LOWEY to ensure that the State Department has what it needs to do these things, the war on terror, to provide humanitarian assistance to the most needy, and to improve human rights around the world."

And the gentleman offers a cut to the ranking member's acknowledgment of how important this product is.

So, Mr. Chairman, if this is the Matthew 25 bill, according to Matthew 25, which I repeated earlier, and these gentleman who obviously have come down here at the 11th hour to message on this bill, they missed this part of the statement when I read it earlier, but I will be happy to read it again:

Then the king will say to those on the right: "Come you who are blessed by my father. Take your inheritance, the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat. I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink. I was a stranger and you invited me in. I needed clothes and you clothed me. I was sick and you looked after me. I was in prison and you came to visit me."

Then the righteous will answer him: "Lord, when did we see you hungry and

feed you? Or thirsty and give you something to drink? When did we see you a stranger and invite you in? Or needing clothes to clothe you? When did we see you sick or in prison go to visit you?"

The king will reply: "I tell you, whatever you have done for the least of these, my brethren, you have done it unto me."

Reject the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman's amendment goes to the heart of this bill, which is designed to feed the hungry, clothe the naked and liberate the captive.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had not wanted to take any more time this evening, but I was in my office and I heard several silly suggestions that somehow bills like this are going to seriously add to the deficit and require a tax increase and all of that other frothy nonsense.

I would simply like to quote from a document by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, one of the most respected organizations in this country in terms of keeping everybody honest about budget facts. This is what they said in a report issued today:

"The main dispute between the administration and Congress is over a \$21 billion difference in domestic appropriations. The administration proposes to cut these programs \$16 billion below the 2000 levels after adjusting for inflation and threatens to veto bills that do not contain these cuts. Congress would reject these cuts and instead provide a modest increase to these programs of \$5 billion or 1.4 percent."

The report then goes on to say the following: "Some 81 percent of the increases in appropriations under the emerging bills consist of increases for military and homeland security programs that the President himself requested. Less than one-tenth, or \$5 billion of the funding increases reflected in the congressional targets for the 2008 appropriation bills, are for increases for eight domestic appropriations bills."

Then it goes on to say, "Under the planned appropriations, those bills would increase a modest 1.4 percent above the Congressional Budget Office baseline."

Then, get this: "In real per capita terms, that is, after adjustment for both inflation and population growth, funding for these programs would barely increase at all."

And as for the nonsense that somehow these bills will require a tax increase or add to the deficit, the report goes on to say, "As a share of the economy, funding for these programs would actually edge down slightly." Then it points out also that the increases in these bills rise more slowly than the expected increase in revenues.

What that means, for anybody who has been through second-grade math, is that you cannot add to the deficit, if that is the case, unless you decide to pass further tax cuts paid for with bor-

rowed money, as the former majority so blithely did over the past 5 years.

I would also say one other thing. It is easy for any citizen and any Member to demagogue foreign aid. I chaired that subcommittee for 10 years. And let me tell you, there is no piece of legislation that this Congress passes each year that saves the lives of more children than this bill. If you take a look at what we do for children's health, if you take a look at what we do through immunizations and these other programs, there is no program that we pass that saves the lives of more children.

We spent a lot of time talking about the right to life today. Well, this bill is a whole lot more effective than lectures from politicians about celibacy or any other matter. This bill actually delivers the goods in terms of the practical things we can do to help our fellow creatures on this planet.

I want to say one other thing. My religious values teach me that we are not Americans because of any special merit that we have. We were just lucky enough that God decided to infuse our soul in a body born in the USA. He could just as easily have made us a child born in Bangladesh, Sudan, or any of the other most troublesome spots in the world, the most agonized spots in the world.

□ 2130

Any idiot can put together an across-the-board cut. All that means is that you don't think. This is supposed to be not the mandatory part of the budget, but the discretionary part of the budget. It means you are supposed to think and apply your values to what you do. That is what this bill does, and I urge you to reject these amendments.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair, if the Chair might opine as to words that might offend and be inappropriate to the decorum of the House being spoken, and the Chair might want to admonish individuals to refrain from making those kind of statements.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from any disparaging remarks of a personal character against another Member.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. And I thank the Chair for that.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I think you are able to get time on your side. I don't believe I have time to spare.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia controls the time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do appreciate the chairman's passion and also appreciate his reference to "frothy nonsense." I would suggest that frothy nonsense in my district and across this Nation comes due in the form of a tax bill when we increase

spending across this Nation and that my constituents, and I suspect constituents around this Nation, would prefer that we decrease the frothy nonsense going on here in Washington.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is quite a debate that we are having tonight, and I appreciate the vigor and the energy that colleagues on both sides are bringing to this debate.

Mr. Chairman, I do have to stand and really oppose some of the things that are being said here. How interesting it is that we are hearing spending reductions called irresponsible, that we are hearing that it is jeopardizing our foreign operations, that it is devastating.

You know, what we may want to do is reframe this debate. I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia for trying to make a 1 percent reduction.

Now we heard this referred to as the Matthew 25 bill. Maybe we should make it the Genesis 1:1 bill and go back and look at the beginning and talk about how did we get where we are today.

They want to talk about deficits. Well, it is historically what my colleagues on the left have done to grow a huge bureaucracy that continues to need to be fed and programs that grow and grow and grow.

Now one of the things that we have heard is that we are going to have to fix this now. My colleagues only want to talk about today, yesterday or the day before. They don't want to go back and talk about previous administrations where we have piled on, we have piled on, we have piled on, and now we want to grow this budget 9½ percent. We want to pay for it with the largest tax increase in history.

I would offer to my friends that, yes, indeed, let's go back and make it a Genesis 1:1 bill and look at the very beginning. You tax too much; you spend too much. And it is right that we would choose to find a 1 percent reduction. What we are irresponsible to is the American taxpayer who is sick and tired. They are truly ill and fatigued when it comes to paying more and more of their budget.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman.

I just cannot let this go. Pile on and pile on and pile on? Let me tell you what has been piled on, \$3 trillion in debt, piled on by the other side.

Growing government? The other side was in charge for the past many years. Their party ran the White House, the Senate and the House of Representatives; and they piled on \$3 trillion of debt.

And now we hear the unmitigated audacity of suggesting that we are the problem. Mr. Chairman, we are not the problem. We are trying to solve the problem.

And I would say with all due respect to the gentlewoman and to those on

the other side who believe that this foreign operations bill is too expensive, is the gentlewoman advocating cutting by 1 percent foreign military financing or international military education and training? Is the gentlewoman suggesting to her constituents that we should slash budgets to professionalize other militaries to assist us in the global war on terror, to make sure that they have the technology and the equipment to help win the global war on terror?

Because if you are suggesting a 1 percent cut or 2 percent cut or 3 percent cut in this bill, you are suggesting a cut in our national security. You are suggesting reducing the amount of military assistance, education, and foreign military sales that we are providing to our allies around the world.

Mr. Chairman, they are costing their own congressional districts jobs, defense contractors who are part of this Nation's defense. We will lose revenues because of these cuts to foreign military financing.

This is not just a foreign operations bill. This is a national security bill. It is a homeland security bill. They go hand in hand, and we should not be advocating slicing off one of those hands while we are fighting a global war on terror surrounded by threats.

We Democrats believe that we need a robust ability to meet that threat, not cut defense budgets as the other side is suggesting.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) to finish her speech.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, what an incredibly wonderful debate we are having. It is a philosophical debate. Government is not the answer. Government many times is the problem. More spending is not the answer. It is priorities and where you choose to put that money. That is where you find your answers in this.

Now one of the things that we are saying is make a reduction. My goodness, look at the States. Many of our States have made across-the-board reductions. You know what? Across-the-board reductions work.

My State of Tennessee, oh, my goodness, we were going to have to have an income tax. Oh, my goodness, they were going to shut down every program in the State, had to have it, had to raise taxes. You know what? We defeated that income tax, Mr. Chairman. The people of our State said, no, we have had it. We are not putting another penny into the State treasury.

Now what we see is a, believe it or not, Democrat Governor who came in and took what we Republicans had said and made across-the-board cuts. Not 1 percent. Not 2. Not 5 percent. 9½ per-

cent. 9½ percent. And I would encourage my colleagues to know that greater efficiencies were there, that they now have record surpluses.

One of the things that we have to realize, the American taxpayer is tired of sending money to Washington and see it go into a bureaucracy and know that they are not seeing the results that they get.

Mr. Chairman, maybe it is because I have the old Davy Crockett district. I know that what you have to do is be very careful with the money that you have to spend. You have to make priorities.

And yes, indeed, national security is a priority. We know that. We know that border security is a priority. We know that. But what we have to realize is we have to be a good steward of the taxpayer dollar.

Maybe it is time for the bureaucracy to start to tighten its belt. Maybe it is time for the bureaucracy to realize it cannot grow. Maybe it is time for the bureaucracy to realize we need to be responsible to the taxpayer and reduce what we are spending at the Federal level. They are tired of paying for the largest tax increase in history. They know that government spends too much. They know that this budget is bigger than it ought to be, and they don't like it, and we are hearing about it.

What my colleagues and I are saying is, you know what, let's find some ways to make some reductions. Let's make certain that we are good stewards of every dollar that comes our way.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield that minute to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the learned orthopedic surgeon from Georgia for yielding me this time.

I want to say something to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. When he was talking about an idiot can offer a 1 percent cut amendment, I certainly hope he wasn't talking about my good friend from Georgia.

Now if you want to talk about fuzzy math and idiots, we can do that here tonight. Because this bill increases the spending 9½ percent. What the learned surgeon's amendment does is cut that by 1 percent.

Now you can say this isn't going to cause a tax increase, you can say it is not going to cost people more money, you can say anything you want to, but the people of this country are smarter than that because they know every day that if they spend more money it is going to cost somebody at some point.

So they can say anything they want to. They can talk about all of the fuzzy math, whether it is going to be a tax

increase or not a tax increase. But when you spend 10 percent more money, somebody is going to pay for it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has already exercised the prerogative of striking the requisite number of words and was recognized for 5 minutes in that regard.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be granted an additional minute.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleague for yielding.

We are having a debate here about whether we should cut spending. Most American families go through a process of trying to decide what it is they can afford in their family budget. The American people send us here to make the same kind of decisions. But when we just add spending and add spending and add spending, which we have done all year, guess what, we don't have to make decisions.

That is exactly what is happening here. The majority wants to denigrate this amendment because they think it is frivolous. They think it is an across-the-board 1 percent cut; you don't have to think.

The point I am trying to make and my colleagues are trying to make, we are sent here to make decisions; and if the majority isn't going to make decisions, we are going to try to make the decisions easier. Let's just have a 1 percent across-the-board cut, bring this budget in line with what the President requested on behalf of the American people.

I have been hearing all year from my friends on the other side that we heard the electorate and we heard the message they sent to us. Well, I have to tell you that one of the messages they sent to us is that we here in Congress need to be more fiscally responsible.

We are going to have a debate over spending all summer. We are going to have a debate over spending all fall. Because, at some point, how much government do we need? How much of the American family budget to we need to take in taxes?

I think my colleague has a very good amendment here. I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, talk about crocodile tears. This bill is \$700 million below the amount requested by the President of the United States. The other side cries about the fact that it is \$2.9 billion over last year, and they say this is the baby that is going to break the bank.

This is the same crowd that has supported over \$600 billion, all borrowed money, to pay for the most misguided, misbegotten, destructive war in the modern history of the United States, all paid for with borrowed money.

□ 2145

I didn't hear any cries about fiscal responsibility then. No, no, no. They spent it blindly, and now they are saying that this bill, which is really an attempt to clean up a lot of the world's messes left over from past wars, that somehow this bill is the one that broke the bank. That is so silly, I would laugh if it wasn't so serious.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and I congratulate her for the work she has done.

First of all, this bill is \$700 million below what the Republican President asked us to spend. All of this stuff about how we're the big spenders, when this bill is \$700 million less than President Bush asked us to spend. Number one.

I have been in this House for 26 years. Eighteen of those years we have had Republican Presidents. During those 18 years, we have run up \$4.5 trillion of deficit spending. One person in America can stop spending: a President. During those 26 years, a veto of a President that was vetoed because we spent too much money has never been overridden. Not once. \$4.5 trillion of deficit spending under Ronald Reagan, George Bush I, and 6 years of George Bush II.

Now, Bill Clinton was President for 8 years during those 26 years that I have served. And we ended up with a \$62.5 billion surplus in those 8 years. And perhaps if you come to this floor and say it enough, the big lie said over and over and over and over again, just like Frank Luntz wrote it for you, maybe the American public will believe it. Isn't it a shame, however, that Frank Luntz can't fix the figures in your budget document.

You have been in control, of course, for the last 6 years of everything. And guess what happened? We doubled the rate of spending from the Clinton administration to the last 6 years. Doubled it. And we, I can't know what the geometric figure is in terms of escalating the debt and going from a \$5.6 trillion surplus which George Bush, President of the United States, said Bill Clinton left him, and you turned that into a \$3 trillion deficit in 72 months. I daresay nobody in the history of the world has done that. Nobody in the history of the world has been that fiscally irresponsible. And for the large part you did it without a single Democratic vote. And you didn't need us to vote, because you were in control of everything.

And I sit there and listen to this, and I won't characterize it as my chairman characterized it, although I can't say that I come here and disagree with my chairman, but I won't characterize it. But honesty at some point in time has a virtue. You ought to try it. Just for a little bit.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Are comments not supposed to be addressed to the Chair?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded that their remarks shall be addressed to the Chair.

The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. HOYER. My remarks are always addressed to the Chair, in case you need interpretation. Just assume that I am addressing the Chair.

Now, if any of my friends when they hear about me talking about irresponsibility would take that personally, understand that it is meant simply to be addressed to the Chair.

But if the shoe fits, put it on.

My friends, you have been a part for the last 6 years of the most fiscally irresponsible leadership in our history. The facts speak to that. Your budget book speaks to that. And what did you do, this family budget leadership group that we hear talking about? They jettisoned, they abandoned, they eliminated PAYGO provision which, by the way, was adopted in a bipartisan fashion in 1997 after we adopted it in 1990 in a bipartisan fashion. But you said, no, we can't live within PAYGO. That's too tight for us. Families might have to live in that, but we can't live in it.

So what did you do? You simply eliminated PAYGO. Well, we've re-instituted PAYGO, and our budget reaches balance. And we don't raise taxes. You like to say we raise taxes because, after all, Frank Luntz told you, Just say they're raising taxes. Doesn't matter whether it's true. The American public will believe it.

Ladies and gentlemen, this debate is designed to mislead the American public, because they don't read the budgets and the fine print. They perhaps do not remember that in 18 years, Republicans ran up \$4.5 trillion of deficit spending while under Bill Clinton's administration we created a \$62.5 billion net surplus with 4 years of surplus, the first time that has happened in the lifetime of anybody in this Chamber.

So I say to my friends that we can debate the substance of this bill, which is \$700 million less than your President asked us to spend. The gentlewoman from New York has brought a responsible bill to this floor. The problem with these across-the-board cuts and what Mr. OBEY really meant, Mr. Chairman, is that it is simple to say cut across the board, because you don't have to make any decisions. You don't

have to defend any premise. You just have to say cut 1 percent. And as was pointed out earlier by Mr. ISRAEL, does that mean 1 percent in defense spending? Does that mean 1 percent in military financing? Where they purchase, by the way, weapons from the United States of America. Does it mean a 1 percent cut in salaries or administration of critical programs that might be small programs? You don't have to decide. It's so simple. One percent. Won't hurt anybody. Fine. Then say where you want to cut.

I was an appropriator for 25 years and I don't like the across-the-board cuts because they are simplistic, imprecise, and cut the good with the bad. May there be bad in this bill? There may be. Offer an amendment to cut the bad and let's debate that, whether it's good or bad.

So, my friends, don't talk to me about fiscal responsibility. I've been here too long and I know too many of the facts. You cannot fool me. You can fool some of the people some of the time. You didn't fool them last November. And I don't think you're going to fool them in the future.

This is a responsible bill. If you don't like some portions of it, we've had 50-plus amendments for you to strike certain portions of it. But don't come to the floor and pontificate on fiscal responsibility. And, by the way, my friend, the government today is larger than the government when you inherited it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION

SEC. ____ Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act (other than for assistance for Israel) that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, this debate has gotten very interesting. There are some of us in the Chamber, Mr. Chairman, that have been concerned about fiscal discipline for a long time. We have been called things like budget hawks. Mr. Chairman, we were willing to take on our own party on that issue and we were also willing to take on our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because, Mr. Chairman, when I think about this debate tonight and I think about the national debt being over \$3.8 trillion, you know, I would have to think that there are people around this Nation tonight watching this debate and wondering why in the world Congress, and there have been many mistakes in the past, why Congress can't get serious about the way we spend taxpayers' dollars.

My amendment would offer an across-the-board cut. And I know that has been criticized by my friends on the other side of the aisle, but, you know, sometimes an across-the-board cut makes a lot of sense. And I am interested to think about spending levels where we cannot cut 50 cents out of each \$100 that we spend.

I offered an amendment that was not accepted in the unanimous consent agreement that would have highlighted one of the more egregious forms of waste and abuse of the funding in this bill, and this was an article in the Boston Globe that I read, and they broke a story last February about the former executive director of the Global Fund and how he used Global Fund dollars. I want to tell you what the Global Fund is supposed to do. It's an organization that is supposed to combat global diseases like AIDS and malaria and tuberculosis.

Let me tell you how he spent our American tax dollars. He spent between \$91 and \$930 a day for limousines in London and Paris and Washington and San Francisco, averaging almost \$400 a day for limousines. He spent \$1,695 for a dinner for 12 at the United States Senate Dining Room here at the Capitol. Then he spent \$8,780 for a boat cruise on Lake Geneva in Switzerland; \$8,436 for a dinner in Davos, Switzerland; and then they had champagne and expensive meals. I wonder if the American taxpayer thinks that this is frivolous nonsense. You know they do. They would be outraged to think that they get up, go to work every day, work for their children, work to pay for their home, work to buy the college education for those kids that they dream of, and people are spending their tax dollars like this.

You know, I think an across-the-board cut sounds great. I would like a larger one, but I'm asking for a modest half of 1 percent, 50 cents out of \$100. You know, when you look at your children and you look at your grandchildren, Mr. Chairman, and you think about that debt, and I don't care who you want to blame it on, Republicans, Democrats, Republican Presidents, Democrat President, we at this time in

history have an opportunity to be responsible with the American taxpayers' dollars and cut this increase in this budget from 9.5 percent to 9.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, we have expressed our real concerns about these cuts and I strongly oppose this amendment.

In addition to the cuts that have been mentioned by my colleagues, I wonder if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the gentlewoman from Colorado in particular, really understands the impact of this across-the-board cut.

First of all, this bill has already been cut 2 percent from the President's request. Two percent. Now you are recommending another half percent.

You support a \$120 million cut for Israel, Mrs. MUSGRAVE? You support a \$120 million cut in aid for our ally Israel? You support a \$250 million cut for HIV/AIDS?

□ 2200

You support \$200 million for foreign military financing; and my colleague, Mr. ISRAEL, talked about the impact on the military that these cuts would cause.

My colleagues, this is a bill that is in the national security interest of the United States of America. We have heard many people on the other side of the aisle that we have to fight it over there. We don't want to fight it over here.

Well, when you are funding HIV/AIDS, when you are preventing avian flu, when you are funding our colleagues in the war on terror, we are fighting it over there rather than fighting it over here.

I strongly, strongly, would not support the cuts which you are recommending. I strongly oppose them.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct a statement I made. I referred to a cut.

My amendment would take a 9.5 percent increase in funding in this bill over the last one to a 9 percent increase.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for bringing this creative amendment to the floor.

While I address the Chair, let me also acknowledge there may be others looking in. I want to be very clear on the point that what we are asking here is for this foreign operations budget to get by on only a 9 percent increase instead of a 9.5 percent increase.

Back in Indiana, we just call this a haircut. But it is a haircut, as the

gentlelady from Colorado said, that is a reduction of the increase.

As I listened to the distinguished majority leader, who I enjoy and admire more than anyone else in this Chamber, he said if the shoe fits, wear it.

I understand the frustration of looking across the aisle and seeing many of my colleagues in my party who voted for an awful lot of government programs over the last 6 years complaining about government spending, but then there is another saying that says if it does not fit, you must acquit.

I would offer that for many of us asking for this very small haircut tonight, it does not fit us. We fought these budget increases. We fought the creation of new entitlements. Now we are coming before this majority in a spirit of collegiality and asking might we not do with \$171 million less. Might we not do with just, instead of a 9.5 percent increase, how about a 9 percent increase.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask you the time remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York has 8 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from Colorado has 5 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. I would like to thank my colleague from New York and also my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, you know, it's interesting to have that discussion about what is a haircut. At this very time this would lead, if I am not mistaken, this actual amendment would lead to about a \$150 million cut to assistance in Israel. At no time is there a more precarious moment in Israel's history since the founding of the State of Israel, since you have now a war in Lebanon that is affecting the security of the State of Israel. You have the Gaza strip, which has been turned over to Hamas, an enemy of the United States. There is no time that is a more precarious moment in Israel's security.

You have what's going on in Lebanon on its northern side. You have what's going on in Iraq, Jordan, dealing with over 1 million Iraqi refugees; Gaza being taken over by Hamas, which is committed to Israel's destruction.

And what do our Republican colleagues recommend? A cut in assistance to the only democracy in the Middle East that is facing its most serious threat on its northern border, its southern border and, in fact, what's going on to its near eastern border. This is a precarious moment in Israel security.

I do believe there can be cuts. I find every time we want to cut assistance to big oil companies, you guys can't find the will. But when it comes to cutting assistance to Israel, you find the will to do that. When it comes to cutting assistance, when it realizes with our military commitment to our allies

around the world, you know what, since everybody wants to make a quote, talk is cheap. Talk is cheap when it comes to standing next to your allies. We must put our resources to the only democracy in the Middle East.

This would directly affect Israel. It would directly affect Egypt. It would directly affect the countries we rely on as the bulwark against the spread of terrorism in the Middle East.

I would hope you understand. I see the politics. I know a little bit about politics. I see the politics in a simple half-percent cut. It happens to be politics at the expense of our allies who are on the front line in the fight against terrorism.

I would think better of you, of what you have always said rhetorically on the floor about your commitment to democracies in the Mideast.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it perfectly clear that if you had read the amendment you would see that no assistance to Israel is cut. We have common enemies, we have common values, and I am a strong supporter of Israel.

If the gentleman who just made the remarks would look at the amendment, he would see there are no cuts to Israel.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady for offering this amendment, which is offered as one of a series of amendments put forward by the fiscal conservatives in this House in a modest effort to try to restrain spending when the new majority has adopted a budget that assumes the largest tax increase in history by assuming that the Bush tax cuts are going to go away.

On the contrary, the President's budget, which we are trying to stay within, assumes that those tax cuts are going to stay in place.

So it's important, Mr. Chairman, for everyone listening to know that these cuts, which we are offering in spending, which are very modest, can also be seen as tax cuts. Every dollar we save in this appropriations process is a dollar that will not be spent in the future, which the Democrats assume in their budget is going to come from the repeal of the Bush tax cuts.

So I applaud the gentlewoman from Colorado for offering this amendment, and it's important to remember, also, as we go through this debate, that all of the Members who are offering these amendments voted against most of those big spending increases over these last many years. I, for one, got re-elected because I voted against most of those big new entitlements and spending increases.

I know that the gentlewoman from Colorado, the gentleman from Georgia, my colleague from Georgia, my colleague from Indiana joined me, along with many other members of the Republican Study Committee, in voting

against those big spending increases. So the shoe indeed does not fit these conservative Members.

We are proud to stand up here to try to do our best, one brick at a time, to control the out-of-control spending by Congress and to prevent the biggest tax increase in American history.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to put a little bit of a face on this across-the-board cut, squeeze and trim, the sort of idiotic approach to spending here in this United States government, particularly in this budget.

We happen to have a global war of terrorism going on. In that global war, there are a lot of people that don't like the United States.

But there is a program that the United States has that they very much like. They like it because countries are asking at an all-time high, send us more; we want more. More countries signing up wanting more people.

What is that program? It's the Peace Corps. And guess what? It's funded in this program.

You know what? The American public out there wants to join the Peace Corps at an all-time high. No, it doesn't matter. Just cut the program. Cut the program. Don't separate the good from the bad. Just cut it.

Well, this is why it's also idiotic. Because, as you have heard, this program funds an international military education program.

A few months ago at this roster, we had a Joint Session of Congress; and giving that address was King Abdullah of Jordan. Guess where King Abdullah found his love for the United States? Studying at the Naval postgraduate school in Monterey, California, where 500 foreign officers come and study along with our officers every year.

But, no, that doesn't count. We want to work on trying to get mutual understanding to our allies. Cut that program. Cut it across the board.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have heard from a lot of cut, squeeze and trim fiscal conservatives on the other side of the aisle tonight. I would hope that their hometown press is looking whether they, example of leadership, are cutting their own budgets from what they have spent last year. If they have done that in their own offices, cut their own spending, then they have a leg to stand on. But to come up here and tell everybody else we ought to cut across the board foreign aid is a danger to Americans all over the world.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from New Jersey, a member of the subcommittee, Mr. ROTHMAN.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, what would my Republican friends have said if the Democrats had offered to cut the President's requested spending on foreign affairs by \$700 million last year when they were in the majority? They would have said that the Democrats were irresponsible.

This year, now that the Democrats are in the majority, we are proposing to cut \$700 million from President Bush's request for spending on foreign aid. The Democrats, to cut \$700 million from President Bush's request for spending, and that's what we are proposing.

But my Republican friends, who were in the majority all those years rubber-stamping the out-of-control Bush budgets every single year, rubber-stamping those budgets, they say that this year, when the Democrats want to reduce President Bush's spending on foreign aid versus his request by \$700 million, should be doing it another \$170 million more if we Democrats were really serious.

I think people can see through that as the political argument that it is, the partisan attack when there is nothing else going for you.

Because, after all, this is the same group that says there is going to be a tax increase under the Democratic majority this year. They say it over and over again.

But, of course, that's not true. So why would someone keep repeating something, attacks on the Democrats, saying we are raising taxes this year, when it's not true? Why would the Republicans continue to say that time and time again?

Well, you would have to say, well, they must not have much else to talk about, other than to make up something that's not true.

Well, how about this for values, my friends? They talk about values. The Democrats' proposal on foreign aid will fund training of foreign troops to help us fight the war on terror, aid our allies like Israel, fighting HIV/AIDS all over the world and feeding the hungry all over the world. And they say we cut \$700 million from the President's request, we should cut even more if we are responsible, when they rubber-stamped their President's high budgets before.

They are criticizing \$170 million in spending, which we think is essential. They are spending \$50 billion, not \$170 million, they are spending \$50 billion on tax cuts for Americans with incomes of \$1 million a year. Americans with \$1 million a year get \$150 billion in tax cuts. I think the values are wrong on the other side.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentlelady from Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, the other side has been very good tonight, as they are

most every night since they have been in the majority of retelling and retelling over and over the sins of the past.

Quite frankly, those sins are hard to deny, given the empirical evidence is there. We have spent a lot of money and raised the size of this government.

That being said, though, my colleagues' arguments seem to rest on the premise that, because the Republicans were spending more and screwing this thing up, that somehow this gives the Democrats, gives them some license to continue that process, to continue building on this growing government and spending more money in fiscal 2008 than we will bring in.

Now, we have heard some arguments that this is not deficit spending, but, quite frankly, there will be more money spent under this budget in 2008 than we will take in. In the simplest form, that is a deficit.

I am not, personally, a big fan of across-the-board cuts. I agree with some of the arguments said on the other side that it's mechanical, but, quite frankly, we need to start somewhere on the path to fiscal responsibility, and this is a modest start down that path.

I urge support for that amendment.

□ 2215

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I think that we're all beginning to figure this out now. When this original amendment was offered, it was advertised as a cut to the foreign assistance budget, despite the fact that Democrats already cut the foreign assistance budget.

Then we were told, oh, except it doesn't really include Israel. We're exempting Israel.

Then we were told, oh, it's Israel, and also, any appropriations that are not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law.

And so we start off with a cut, and then we say, well, not really a cut. We're going to void this and ignore that and sequester this and sequester that.

We're down to Secretary of State licensed chauffeur, my colleagues. That's what we're down to. We're down to the linens at state dinners. If you want to do a cut, do a cut. If my colleagues want to do a cut, do a cut. But don't try and fool the American people.

All we've heard from the other side is we have to ferret out waste, fraud and abuse, except we can't exactly find it, so we'll let you figure out.

Well, the American people have figured it out. You said you don't want to hurt national security, and yet this is a cut to foreign military financing.

You've said you want to win the global war on terror, and yet this is a cut to international military education and training.

You've said you want to cut, but not here, there, or anywhere else.

As our distinguished majority leader said previously, the truth is important, and it ought to be tried every once in a while.

What we have heard over the past several minutes is nothing but a hoax on the American people, and they're not going to fall for it.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, some people would not call it a hoax if we save 50 cents on every \$100 dollars that we spend, that the hardworking taxpayers of this country have provided for us.

I yield 1½ minutes to my friend from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I love coming down and listening to the majority leader when he comes down. You know, I was a real estate salesman. I felt like I was a pretty good real estate salesman. And a good salesman loves to hear another salesman. And I think the majority leader could sell an Eskimo ice cubes.

But let me say this. He made a statement that the Republicans did not fool the people in November. We didn't. Y'all did. And I think the joke is up. I think the gig is up. I think the foolish is up, because now the ratings of this Congress are at 13 percent, which is about half of what they were when the Republicans in charge.

So you're right. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I would like to recognize the ranking member.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. And I would like to recognize, if I can, ROY BLUNT for whatever time he may consume. And I will ask to strike the last word to do so.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I'd like to yield to my colleague, Mr. BLUNT.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And this is a good debate. It's a little more spirited at moments than I think it could be. In fact, I didn't mean to speak again on this until I heard the second-grade math explanation from my good friend, Mr. OBEY. And I did pretty good in second-grade math. I even did fairly good in 12-grade math. And I did okay in college math. But second-grade math was a little bit of a stretch, I thought, because I tried to follow the second-grade math outline we had on why this was actually, according to some group, a cut in spending.

According to my friend, Mr. OBEY, if I heard this right, if you took inflation, and then you took the population growth of the world, I thought that was an interesting element to the equation, and then if you took the deficit as a percentage of the economy, that that actually might be a cut.

This spending is 9½ percent over last year's spending. I've never seen the President's numbers so praised by our friends on the other side as it's been tonight. It may be the only time that the

President had either a perfect number or a number that was just slightly too high.

In fact, I understand this is \$700 million less than the President's number. That's a lot of money. But it's not as much money as the \$2.6 billion this is over last year's spending. That's a lot more money.

Now, this is a 9½ percent increase. And somebody else said, is this going to be the baby that's going to break the bank? Probably not. But if every one of these bills goes up, it's going to have a big impact.

And my good friend, Mr. HOYER, said the government today is larger than the government you inherited, pointing at us. And then I guess the point is, and we're going to make it bigger. I didn't get that at all. The government's larger than the government you inherited, he said, pointing to us. So we're going to increase these spending bills, this one by 9½ percent.

Very few American families got a 9½ percent increase last year. And almost none of them got to take the rate of inflation, the population growth somewhere, and whatever they had as a percent of the entire national economy and decide how that number added up.

This is a 9½ percent growth in the foreign assistance part of the budget. This amendment says, let's just do a little less than we did last year and see if we can't make up with that with efficiency. One of the other amendments said, let's just do what we did last year.

But this is a \$2.6 billion growth. Let's not anybody be confused that that's a cut, or it relates to some complicated formula, or somehow if you didn't understand second-grade math, you would realize this wasn't a real increase. This is an increase. This is too much of an increase.

We need to start doing the kinds of things on this bill and the other bill that hold the line, as we did hold the line on the discretionary non-defense budget in the past Congresses. We looked at the entitlement programs in the past Congress. None of that's happening in this Congress. So those programs are going to grow until we're told the budget's balanced.

And by the way, in 35 of the last 39 Congresses, the budget wasn't balanced. And in seven of those, that was our fault, and the circumstances we dealt with. In the other 28, the majority party's party was in control.

We need to be doing better. We need to start now. This is real growth that families couldn't just pass off as some complicated formula. We shouldn't either. We should be able to cut this budget by the one-half of 1 percent that the gentlelady from Colorado has suggested.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, tonight I again am amazed that our President's numbers have been so highly esteemed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. And I don't believe I've ever heard a debate where so

much Scripture was quoted by the folks that constantly talk about the separation of church and state. So it's been quite an amazing evening here.

When the American people see all this, perhaps their heads spin as we talk about all these things, and maybe they don't understand everything we say because we're in this political arena. We're serving in Congress. And they're working hard every day trying to provide for their families.

But I think what the American people would understand, Mr. Chairman, I have 2 quarters in this hand. This is 50 cents. In this other hand I have a dollar bill, a \$100 bill. The American people know that government spends too much money. All I'm asking for in this amendment is for us not to spend this 50 cents.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. OBEY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I won't take the 5 minutes. But let me say that I find it rather humorous that our good friends on the other side of the aisle would utter not one peep when this President decides to spend over \$600 billion on a war in Iraq which he misled the country into, which he didn't have a clue of how to get out of, and now he's asking us to make a commitment that will lead over the next 20 years to the expenditure of at least \$1 trillion more for that same misguided cause. Not a peep; most of their buttons wired right to the White House, wired right to Karl Rove's desk.

And yet, it's the same crowd that will then make a Federal case out of the fact that when we cut the President's budget for foreign aid we didn't cut it quite enough. And so they're making a Federal case out of one-half of 1 percent.

My good friend, Archie the Cockroach observed once, "Remember the importance of proportion. Of what use is it for a queen bee to fall in love with a bull?"

Think about it. If you do, you'll realize just how silly and misguided this debate is, because this is a crowd who spent willingly \$600 billion on the most damaging war in recent American history, and yet are now objecting to the President's request to fund a bill which is traditionally meant to repair our relationships around the world and to pay a little bit of the cost of citizenship on a planet where many millions of people are a whole lot less fortunate than we are.

I'm also amused by the fact that we hear a constant cry from the other side of the aisle, "We need bipartisanship. Politics ends at the water's edge." And then when we try to demonstrate a little bipartisanship by giving the President most of what he asked, but not all, we then get the White House complaining because we've cut this bill too deeply, and we get their supporters in this House crying that we didn't cut it

deeply enough. I get whiplash trying to follow the direction of a party that is that schizophrenic.

So with all due respect, we understand that this is a marginal debate. It is a debate ginned up to try to find any excuse whatsoever to bring down this bill.

It's not going to do it. Let's get on with the public's business. Let's be responsible. Let's reject this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund nongovernmental organizations, specifically named in the report accompanying the Act, outside of a competitive bidding process.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 2230

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that a point of order has been lodged and will prevail, and I will withdraw this. But let me just make the point here.

This bill, like previous years' bills making appropriations for the State Department and for foreign operations, doesn't include earmarks in the traditional sense. In other words, it doesn't direct agencies to fund specific programs for parochial interests.

However, the report accompanying the bill makes reference to several nongovernmental organizations by name. I think it is most accurate to refer to these as "soft earmarks."

Scattered throughout the report is language which reads as follows: "The committee is aware of the work of," and you can insert your favorite organization here, "and encourages USAID to consider supporting such work in fiscal year 2008."

I would suppose that, given the agencies we are funding, some of these NGOs are based overseas or are international organizations, and I have no doubt that many of them are doing good work. But why are they any more worthy than the hundreds of other organizations that are not named?

My amendment does not strike funding for any NGO. Rather, it simply would remove any funding preference for any of the organizations that are listed in the bill over organizations that are not listed in the bill. This amendment simply would prevent funding from going to any of these organizations outside of a competitive bidding process. With the efforts to shine more light on the earmarking process, I am concerned that we might see increasingly creative ways to steer funding to recipients of funding that Members of Congress want to see it go to.

I would like to know how these organizations managed to get mentioned by those named in the report. Who made these requests? Was it the administration? Was it Members of Congress? Was it the committee as a whole? Or the organizations themselves? Will the committee disclose this kind of information? Are these agencies going to be under any undue pressure to give preference to these organizations? Will there be any accounting for whether they have received funding or whether they had gone through a fair bidding process? Are we going to see similar soft earmarking in the future now that there is a brighter spotlight on earmarking in Congress?

I would welcome any answers to this question now or I would like to work with the committee to understand the rationale for this type of soft earmarking.

With that, unless the chairwoman would explain this or enlighten me as to what these soft earmarks are doing or how they come about, I would be glad to withdraw this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the committee is going to follow the House rules, and I understand the gentleman is going to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I will not use the entire 5 minutes, because the amendment I present tonight is one similar to what I offered previously on other sessions of this Congress which have passed on voice vote in a bipartisan manner.

This is an amendment which simply looks to the number of U.S. Government employees who attend international conferences.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the gentleman that we are happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I appreciate that.

And I will just conclude then, Mr. Chairman, by pointing out what the purpose of the amendment was. And that is there have been certain cases where upwards of 150 employees of single government agencies have attended international conferences such as in Africa and other places, and we are just simply saying that it is not wrong for U.S. Government agencies to send their valuable employees over to these international conferences, but we should put some limit on them. Just as small businesses and families have to rein in their budgets and decide what is appropriate as far as their staff going to conferences and the like, so should the Federal Government.

And I appreciate the gentlewoman for accepting the amendment.

I will conclude by saying that perhaps, maybe not in this session but in future sessions, that these amendments may not be necessary on the floor; and I will be glad to work with the gentlewoman in the future to incorporate such language similar to this in the actual underlying bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. We are happy to work with you in the future on this amendment or any other amendments, and I am pleased that we are accepting this amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. CONAWAY: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

DEFICIT REDUCTION

SEC. _____. It is the sense of the House of Representatives that any reduction in the amount appropriated by this Act achieved as a result of amendments adopted by the House should be dedicated to deficit reduction.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is pretty straightforward.

We have heard hours and hours today of debate on whether or not we should cut spending out of this proposed appropriations bill that has been brought forward. The elephant in the room that we don't talk about is, under the mechanics of the law under House rules, were any of these amendments that we will be voting on in a few minutes to pass, they would not actually reduce spending. The amounts would still remain within the 302(b) allocation and would be spent somewhere else within the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

What my amendment would do would be to say that, instead of that being the occurrence, the savings would actually go against the deficit; and should we ever have a surplus, it would actually include that surplus.

I intend to withdraw the amendment. I understand the point of order. But, before I do, Mr. Chairman, I want to make one other comment.

Mr. Chairman, I am a Christian, and I take very seriously the instructions in the New Testament, particularly verses like Luke 12:48 that says, "To whom much is given, much is required." I understand the parable of the sick and the unclothed and the jailed. But I see those instructions to me personally, to take my personal assets, my personal wealth, and deal with those issues for my fellow man. I see no instruction that tells me to take someone else's blessings and wealth to fix those problems.

So I would urge my colleagues to be very careful when they invoke those instructions.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment if I could have some help from the other side in working towards a solution that would allow spending cuts that actually are voted on and passed to reduce deficits and increase surpluses, rather than staying within the 302(b) allocation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENCE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide direct aid to the Palestinian Authority, except as otherwise provided by existing law.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us today includes in various ways tens of millions of dollars that would be directed to advancing U.S. interests in areas known as the West Bank and Gaza.

Given the recent violent and tragic events in the Palestinian territories and the strong commitment of this body to prevent taxpayer funding from reaching the hands of terrorists, I offer an amendment that reinforces previous prohibitions on funding Palestinian terrorist organizations and offer it for my colleagues' consideration on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply states: "None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide direct aid to the Palestinian Authority, except as otherwise provided by existing law."

So what is existing law? The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 was amended by the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act last year, in 2006. It was signed into law in December. It states that, "No ministry, agency or instrumentality of the Palestinian Authority effectively controlled by Hamas" would be eligible for funding unless it meets the basic preconditions of civil society, namely, recognition of Israel and the renunciation of violence.

The purpose of this amendment today is to clarify that assistance may be provided to the Fattah elements of the PA government, assuming such elements are not engaged in the terrorism or compromise by the terrorism of Hamas. Concern about the application of this provision may have led the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mrs. LOWEY, to put a hold and request information from Secretary Rice about her intent to release funding to the PA.

Now, these safeguards and other relevant laws are critical because they prohibit assistance to terrorists, including to a Hamas-controlled Palestinian Authority, but they permit assistance to a PA government that is in

compliance with the principles of recognition of Israel, previous peace agreements, and a renunciation of violence.

Why is it necessary? Well, because, given the systematic instability, we simply don't know what shape the Palestinian government will take in the coming months. Large portions of the Palestinian territories are in virtual anarchy at this moment. Even worse, Gaza is completely dominated by Hamas, a universally recognized terrorist organization. We cannot permit one red cent of U.S. dollars to find its way to Hamas.

After lengthy discussions with the Department of State, including Secretary of State Rice herself, I would like my colleagues to know that this amendment is not opposed by the State Department. In fact, I had a warm and candid conversation today with the Secretary of State, and I told her then that it is critical that we clarify that the Palestinian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 is still the law of the land and reiterate its intent, namely, to deny funding to terrorist entities within the Palestinian leadership.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot permit any ambiguity to exist on this subject. This body should be on the record today, as we have before, that no American tax dollars can be delivered to any authority within the Palestinian territories that is compromised or even tainted by Hamas or other terrorist interests.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept this amendment.

It is my understanding that it reiterates the restrictions on direct aid to the PA that are already in current law that are clearly included in this bill. I certainly expect the administration to abide by these restrictions, and I thank the gentleman for his amendment. In fact, I am wondering why the gentleman is offering the amendment if it is already included in the bill.

I also understand that my good friends on the other side of the aisle are whipping against this bill. This bill provides millions of dollars for Israel and for many good causes all around the world. So for those who are standing up as friends of Israel and want to protect Israel, I wonder why you are whipping against a bill that is providing millions of dollars for Israel.

And I thank the gentleman for your amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

He makes a good point. I am actually for this bill coming forward, but we need to send an important signal.

The administration has said that they are going to provide direct aid to the Palestinian Authority and provide

\$40 million to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency in Gaza. U.S. taxpayers should not be forced to finance a culture of "welfare terrorism."

This morning, Secretary Rice agreed to work with us in upgrading the auditing regime of UNRWA, and we hope that that will include an end to Cash Assistance payments to terrorists and martyr families, with a full independent audit of UNRWA programs outside the U.N. structure.

We have looked in the past at our errors, in the 1990s, when the U.S. poured hundreds of millions of dollars into assistance for the Yassar Arafat government and the return on taxpayer investments was very low indeed. In haste, we should not repeat our errors made just a few short fiscal years ago.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for her support of this amendment. Let me also say to the gentlewoman that I intend to support the underlying legislation and appreciate her strong work in support of Israel.

□ 2245

The reason for bringing this bill, to answer the gentlelady's question, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. In recent days, the State Department has indicated its intent to "lift restrictions on aid to Palestinians." And the Pence amendment today will simply say that any aid that would go to the Palestinian Authority must, with an exclamation point, only go to the Palestinian Authority under current restrictions in current law. That is my sincere intent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment. I also am delighted to know that you will support the bill. It is a good bill. The ranking member and I worked very closely in a bipartisan way. I have the greatest respect for my friend and ranking member, Mr. WOLF. It was really disappointing for me to hear that the whip's office was working against the bill.

I thank you so much. It's a good bill. I appreciate your support, and I'm happy to accept this amendment because the current restrictions, which you rightly suggest, are in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I won't take the 5 minutes. I simply want to say that I appreciate the fact that the committee has accepted this amendment. But let me simply make one point.

Because we have heard on this side of the aisle that the minority party is

whipping against the bill, let me simply say that I would hope that there are no Members of this House who would engage in an act which would give hypocrisy a bad name by voting for this amendment, which in essence simply repeats existing law, and then use that as cover as an excuse to then vote against the bill in final passage. I don't think that friends of Israel would be conned by that. And I would hope, and I have full confidence, that no Member of this House would engage in such hypocrisy.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for his leadership on this issue. I am proud to associate myself with his efforts though I believe it does not go far enough.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleagues when we will learn from our mistakes?

Did we learn anything when Arafat took our money and stashed it in his Swiss bank accounts instead of providing for his own people?

Did we learn anything when Fatah was exposed as nothing but a corrupt gang of thugs?

Did we learn anything when Abu Mazen refused to rout Hamas when he had the chance and showed that his backbone is no stronger than a wet noodle?

Did we learn anything when Israel unilaterally withdrew from the Gaza and Fatah failed to build one school, one hospital, one road, did one thing to improve the lives of its own people, but still came to us with their palms open for more money?

Did we learn when the Palestinian Finance Minister Salam Fayad admitted that hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign aid had been siphoned off, thanks to corruption and malfeasance?

Mr. Chairman, let's stop throwing good after bad. We should cut off funding to the corrupt and ineffectual Palestinian Authority. If I have learned anything it is this: If the U.S. gives Abu Mazen 50 cents or \$50 million or \$500 million more dollars he will be incapable of uniting the Palestinian people, leading the Palestinian people or bringing peace to a very troubled part of the world. I thank the gentleman from Indiana again for addressing this important issue and I yield back.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. BERKLEY

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Ms. BERKLEY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

PROHIBITION AGAINST ASSISTANCE TO SAUDI ARABIA

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act—

(1) shall be obligated or expended to finance any assistance to Saudi Arabia; or

(2) shall be used to execute a waiver of section 571 or 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2349aa or 2364) with regard to assistance to Saudi Arabia.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FERGUSON and myself to offer an important amendment to cut off funding to the Saudi Arabian regime.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons that we need not be sending foreign aid to Saudi Arabia. First, Saudi Arabia does not need our money. They are one of the wealthiest countries in the world, with a GDP of over \$286 billion a year. With poor countries begging us for help, why are we giving money to this oil-rich kingdom? Is not 60, 70, \$80 a barrel enough?

Second, Saudi Arabia exports and funds terrorists and terrorism. Need I remind anyone in this body that 15 of the 9/11 hijackers were Saudi? But the story goes on. By 2005, over 2,500 Saudi youths had entered Iraq to wage jihad against the Americans. That's waging jihad against us. By last month, 3,000 Saudis had been killed or captured in Iraq. Why are all these Saudis fighting in Iraq? Because their government is financing and teaching terrorism.

Israeli officials believe that over half of Hamas' budget comes from Saudi Arabia. Just this week, two indictments were served against Saudi charities that are accused of funding Hamas. Their textbooks still teach Saudi children that Jews are apes, Christians are pigs, and that every other religion other than Islam is false. Their newspapers print anti-Semitic cartoons depicting the Jews as thieves, and, most insulting of all, as Nazis. Already this year our State Department has counted 14 human rights abuses in Saudi Arabia, including beatings, arbitrary arrests, violations of religious freedom, and limitation on workers rights.

The Saudis are not our allies. They are not our friends. King Abdullah called our invasion of Iraq an illegal foreign occupation. Those are not the words of a friend.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot trust them and we should not fund them. That is why every year more and more Members of this body vote to cut off funding to the terrorist regime. And yet, despite all this, the funding for Saudi Arabia has increased. Let me repeat that. It has increased each year be-

cause of an obscure loophole in the Foreign Assistance Act, up to \$1.5 million in 2006. Well, this year we're closing that loophole. Our amendment will ensure that funding to Saudi Arabia is cut off once and for all.

Enough is enough. Let's come to our senses and end this senseless promotion of terrorism. I urge support for the Weiner-Crowley-Ferguson-Berkley amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. WOLF. I am not opposed to the amendment. I am for the amendment. So I will strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FERGUSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia for the time. And I of course rise in strong support of this amendment. I am delighted to, once again this year, work with Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. BERKLEY.

We've offered this amendment in the past. And each year that this Foreign Operations bill includes funding for Saudi Arabia we've offered this amendment, and each year we gain more and more support. Obviously we're disappointed that this bill does include some money for Saudi Arabia, but I'm pleased that offering this bipartisan amendment with broad support on both sides of the aisle, once again we will seek to strip that money.

The bill before us provides \$115,000 in foreign aid for a country that has time and time and time and again proven that it doesn't deserve one cent of American taxpayers' dollars, not only because Saudi Arabia is one of the wealthiest countries in the world, but also because it's not a partner with the United States and other nations in our efforts to combat terrorism.

Saudi Arabia has a pretty poor record on a number of fronts. It's not just a poor record in joining with other allies around the world to combat terrorism. They have a pretty terrible record on human rights, pretty poor record on religious freedom, and they continue to support and participate in the Arab League's boycott of Israel. Now, even recently there was an Arab League boycott meeting in Damascus. The Saudi Government continued to participate in that meeting. All of this despite Saudi Arabia's repeated promises to dismantle the boycott and to support most-favored-nation status for Israel. And Israel, of course, our closest and most important ally in the Middle East, Saudi Arabia continues to undermine the efforts that we are building in the Middle East.

Clearly, Saudi Arabia is not a country that is struggling to make ends meet. Saudi Arabia doesn't need financial support from other nations. And

they certainly can't be considered a strong ally of the United States or the global war on terror.

Last year, more than 300 Members of the House supported this amendment. I am really looking forward to continued broad bipartisan support for this amendment once again this year. And I'm really delighted, once again, to be working with Mr. WEINER and Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. BERKLEY in offering this amendment.

I thank you for yielding.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, perhaps the amendment really doesn't go far enough in the sense that to do something that really matters, there is a real concern that many American Ambassadors to Saudi Arabia are now out working for the Saudi Government. And I have an amendment that we're trying to get through the Rules Committee. Mr. LANTOS and I are working on asking various groups to look into this. There are actually, I understand, CIA station chiefs, American CIA station chiefs who were station chiefs in Saudi Arabia that may be now working for the Saudis.

The Saudis funded the madrassas up along the Pakistan-Afghan border. There were 15 Saudis on the aircraft, one of them went into the Pentagon and killed 30 people from my congressional district. The first person killed in Afghanistan was Michael Spann, a CIA agent from my district, because of the activities of the Saudis.

The Saudis are funding anti-Semitic, anti-Christian activities in some of the schools. This is Wahhabism. I've been kind of shocked. This is a milquetoast amendment. This is a weak amendment. There should be something really strong to get control of this Wahhabism that is spreading.

So, yes, let's pass it. But I would hope the next time we really do something that really can make a difference because this is dangerous. Had they not funded those madrassas, frankly maybe what took place on 9/11 may have never taken place.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to accept the amendment from the gentlelady from Nevada.

Ms. BERKLEY. I want to thank the gentlelady from New York and thank Mr. WOLF. It's nice to be on the same side of an issue for a change, and this is certainly one that I appreciate your support. Perhaps next year we can work on an amendment that will be even stronger than this. I quite agree with you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. Berkley).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KING of Iowa:
At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR TRAVEL BY THE
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TO COUNTRIES THAT ARE STATE SPONSORS OF
TERRORISM

SEC. 6. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to fund or support travel by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Sudan, or Syria.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment is a fairly simple amendment. It goes into the section and limits the funds for travel by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to countries that are state sponsors of terrorism. And it simply says none of the funds may be used to support travel by the Speaker to the nations specifically of Cuba, Iran, North Korea, Sudan or Syria. And the reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is that there are two constraints on the Speaker of the House. One of them is a constitutional constraint that vests the authority of foreign policy into the President of the United States. And that's clear. And that's established in the Constitution and codified by our founders specifically so there wouldn't be a division of messages, that we would speak with one voice on foreign policy.

And when they had problems with that even after the ratification of the Constitution, then they passed the Logan Act, which has been in law for over 200 years. And the Logan Act prohibits anyone representing the United States, without the authority of the administration, to conduct foreign policy. And it's clear that's what happened in Syria, and it was reported in newspapers all over this country in April.

And so this legislation, this appropriation, without my amendment, would allow taxpayers' dollars to support what I believe is unconstitutional behavior and statutory violations.

I urge support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank my good friend from Iowa for providing comic relief at this late hour of this debate.

This carefully constructed, exquisitely constructed absurdity masquerading as an amendment, and on the west coast there are still children watching this program, and I hope they are watching it because this is a rare mo-

ment in the history of the Congress of the United States.

There are 435 Members in this body, every single one of us elected by our constituents. The Speaker of the House, at the moment, happens to be the Representative from the Eighth District of California. Now, if the gentleman were to offer an amendment saying that 434 Members may travel to Cuba and Sudan and Iran and Syria, but the Representative from the Tenth District of Illinois or the Seventh District of Texas may not, he would be laughed out of court. But that is precisely what this so-called amendment purports to do. It says nothing about any other Member of the Congress of the United States.

□ 2300

We are free to travel to Syria. We are free to travel to North Korea. But one of our colleagues, who happens to represent the Eighth District of California, may not.

Now, San Francisco happens to have two Representatives; Ms. PELOSI, who represents the Eighth District, and I represent the Twelfth District. The absurdity that you pretend is an amendment allows the person representing a part of San Francisco to travel to North Korea, to travel to Syria, to travel to Sudan, but the person representing the other part of San Francisco may not.

Now, I really don't think that this amendment can be taken seriously at its face value. There is a hidden message here. That hidden message is a low blow, a pathetically low blow, aimed at our most distinguished Speaker of this body.

I was with the Speaker on her visit, not only to Syria, but to Lebanon and Saudi Arabia. She represented the United States with eloquence, dignity and distinction. It turns my stomach that this sickening partisan attempt to get at the Speaker's performance of her legitimate duties is presented here as an amendment.

Let me, however, deal with the underlying issue. The underlying issue relates to travel to countries with which we disagree. May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that beginning in 1981, at the height of the Cold War, I was appointed chair of our Parliamentary Liaison to the European Parliament. It became obvious to me that most of our colleagues in 1981 had never traveled in the Soviet Union or behind the Iron Curtain. So, every year I took it upon myself to lead a congressional delegation to the Soviet Union and to all the Communist countries of the Soviet bloc.

Many of my colleagues at that time had no passport. But as a result of year after year after year going to these Communist countries, many Members of this body became familiar with the circumstances. Their commitment of anti-Communism was enhanced, and their understanding of the Soviet Union and the Central and East European satellites became much clearer.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, the primitive, absurd, stupid notion that we should not allow Members of Congress to travel to countries with which we have disagreement is really beneath contempt. This know-nothingism has no place in this body. The discriminatory approach of allowing 434 Members of the House of Representatives to travel to the Sudan, to look at Darfur and the tragedy unfolding there, but not to allow the Speaker of the House of Representatives to see with her own eyes the genocide which is taking place in Darfur is not worthy of this body.

I hope that my friend from Iowa will withdraw this pathetic absurdity masquerading as an amendment. It is not an amendment. It is a low blow at the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives. I hope that if the gentleman does not withdraw it, it will be overwhelmingly defeated.

This body is a body of adult men and women who are prepared to go to Syria, Sudan, Cuba, North Korea, and, if the Iranians will let us in, to Iran. At this moment, the Ahmadinejad government does not offer visas to any Member of Congress. I have been attempting to go there for well over 10 years. I hope, one of these days, a group of us will go there.

But the notion of proposing an ostrich policy aimed at the Speaker of the House of Representatives, that she may not go to Cuba, while scores of Republicans and Democrats go, while scores of Republicans and Democrats go to the Sudan and to Syria, is a cheap partisan blow. Days before we went to Syria, three Republican colleagues were in Syria, and I salute them; days after we went there, another Republican colleague went there.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think after that speech, there is absolutely no need to say anything more. The amendment says a whole lot more about the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) than it says about the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment for three reasons. One, I would hope in the next Congress we have a Republican Speaker, and so I wouldn't want to see that side limit our Speaker. That is number one.

Number two, Senator SAM BROWNBACK and I were one of the first ones to go to Darfur. I wish more Members would go to Darfur. I think it is genocide. I think one of the problems is that this place hasn't moved fast enough because people haven't seen it.

They couldn't smell it. They just couldn't feel it. And so to say you couldn't go to Darfur where there is a genocide taking place now is just not a good idea. I have been to Sudan five times. Certainly you couldn't limit the Speaker to go some place that I, as a lowly Member, could go to.

The third reason is that I was one of the Members who went to Syria. Now, I am not a weak person. I used to go to the Soviet Union during the days of Communism and speak out for the dissidents. CHRIS SMITH and I went into Perm Camp 35 and interviewed Sharansky's cellmate and did a lot of things that really made a difference.

When I went to Syria, here is what I said to Assad. With me was ROBERT ADERHOLT, not exactly a liberal Member of the House; JOE PITTS, again, God bless him, a very conservative Member of the House, a good person. Here is what we said to Assad four times, and it was good that he heard it. I said it twice, and Mr. PITTS said it once, and Mr. ADERHOLT said it once. We said, one, stop allowing foreign fighters to come and transit your border. I am not saying it is because of our effort, but 2 weeks after that, the Commanding General in Afghanistan said that the foreign fighters had slowed down. They actually saw the results.

Secondly, Israel's right to exist. Assad should have heard Members. More Members should go tell Assad, Israel has the right to exist.

Thirdly, I said stop supporting Hezbollah and Hamas. We were 4 feet from him. We looked at him directly in the eye and said no more support. We know and they know where Hamas and Hezbollah have their offices. They're in Damascus.

Lastly, we said to them with regard to this, stop interfering in Lebanon's right to exist.

So, I am of the mind, and I may be in the minority of my party, I take the Ronald Reagan approach. Ronald Reagan, when he called the Soviet Union the evil empire, his greatest speech was to the National Association of Evangelicals, Orlando, Florida, 1983. He called them the evil empire. But as he called them the evil empire, he sent people out to talk.

If you recall his speech he gave at Danilov Monastery, where he talked about freedom, Gorbachev was there. Ronald Reagan defeated the Soviets because he went and engaged, not in weakness. He put the Cruise Missiles in in Europe in 1983 when people complained. But he was able to do it.

So, one, I hope we have a Republican Speaker, and I would hope everyone on our side agrees when we have a Republican Speaker in the next Congress.

Two, I went to Sudan. I think everybody in this body ought to go to Sudan. They ought to go to Darfur. Maybe it was because of the failure of people to go to Rwanda. Maybe that wouldn't have taken place.

Lastly, intellectually it would be impossible to say this was a good idea if

I was one of the ones that went. I think by going I served the interests of our Government. I was criticized. I had people criticize me.

□ 2315

But I thought it was good that Assad heard that.

Lastly, I met with the leading dissident in Syria, and I said, "Should we put your name in our release?" And he said, "Please, put my name in." Sharansky used to tell us, "When you spoke out for me, when you said things for me, my life got better."

This dissident said, "Mention my name. Mention my name. I will stand with you," because, he said, "nobody else is coming to meet with me and stand with me." We stood with him, and when we left Syria, after we left, the Syrian Government criticized us for the tone of what they thought we said.

But, God bless, I would hope that every Member of this body would go to Syria and sit down with Assad and say, stop the foreign fighters; Israel's right to exist; stop the support for Hezbollah and Hamas; and stop messing around in Lebanon and let these people who want freedom to have freedom.

For that reason, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that no one here that has traveled to a foreign country has announced a new foreign policy but the Speaker of the House. No one here has pointed out how it is you can contravene the Constitution. We all take an oath, solemnly swear to uphold this Constitution. And no one here has pointed to a law that supersedes the Logan Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to my good friend from California who knows I have a great deal of respect for him, this is not a sickening or pathetic amendment. It is not primitive, stupid or absurd, as it was described. It is not an ostrich amendment. And this is not a low blow, nor is anyone saying that the Speaker of this House is not an eloquent speaker and Representative as she goes forward out into the world as Speaker of this institution.

Nor would I tell my colleagues, is this an amendment about Member travel. No one says that we should not be about educating ourselves so that we can better effect public policy here in our roles as Members of this Congress and as Representatives of the constituents that elect us.

What this is about is about travel by an individual who is second in line to the President of the United States. Like it or not, for the 434 others of us, it does mean something different when the Speaker of the House goes somewhere.

As my friend from Iowa indicates, all reports say when the trip to Syria occurred, that somehow it was perceived on the ground and in the region that somehow the United States was embarking upon new foreign policy.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I would say from Iran's hot pursuit of nuclear weapons to Syria's eagerness to stir violence against our interests in the Middle East, America faces a growing list of terrorist states, as my good friend from California is well aware. And amidst such threats, the United States must speak forthrightly and with one voice.

Iran, Syria, North Korea, Sudan, Cuba, they all are feeble states whose interests are diametrically opposed to ours. Their regimes are vulnerable to international sanction, and they will not change until America and its allies apply enough pressure to endanger their regimes.

I would just say when the Speaker of the House goes to these nations and it is perceived that somehow we are capitulating, it goes against our interests. That is what this amendment is about.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to conclude.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I take us to this path where we are, and I haven't heard the response to the issue of the constitutional constraints that we all have.

I have traveled foreign and I have sat in there in diplomatic discussions and debates and I have heard us get off track. I have heard us put our national security at risk, because sometimes the people that were there on the code weren't tuned in with the administration's policy. I have not seen us take us to the crisis moment, but I have seen the precipice of the crisis moment.

But our founders understood this clearly and that is why they laid that responsibility in the hands of the President of the United States to conduct our foreign policy. That is why he appoints the Ambassadors. That is why he negotiates the treaties. That is why 200 years of tradition and history and constitutional law takes us down this path.

And if we can ignore our oath to the Constitution, then on top of that, how can we ignore the Logan Act, which is the only controlling Federal statute that we have? The Logan Act says no citizen of the United States shall take foreign policy into their own hands.

Our Speaker clearly traveled to a terrorist-sponsored state against the express wishes of the President of the United States.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. Unfortunately, I will shortly withdraw it, for reasons I will explain.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAMBORN:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act for assistance under the West Bank and Gaza program may be made available to or through any individual, private or government entity, or educational institution that does not expressly recognize the right of the State of Israel to exist.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 20, 2007, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would have ensured that none of the funds made available in this bill under the West Bank and Gaza program may be made available to any individual or entity that does not expressly recognize the right of the State of Israel to exist. I brought this amendment to the floor to emphasize the strong sense of this Congress and the United States that the peace process in this region requires all participants to publicly acknowledge the fundamental right of the State of Israel to exist.

Funding an organization that fails to recognize Israel is not acceptable and should not be tolerated by this Congress.

While there have been many opportunities for the Palestinian Liberation Organization in particular to officially recognize Israel's right to exist, it has failed to do so. Until it is held accountable for its failure to make recognition of Israel a formal part of its charter, we as a Nation and in this Congress must be careful not to reward and enable this organization.

Because Hamas controlled the Palestinian Authority after the recent elections, the last Congress felt the need to pass a law, the Palestinian Antiterrorism Act of 2006, to ensure that U.S. funds would not be provided to this terrorist regime. This law, however, does not go far enough, because it fails to make Israel's right to exist part of the law as it applies to the PLO.

In contrast, my amendment would have created a simple formula for determining where to provide assistance and who would be eligible to receive

funds by making the recognition of Israel's right to exist as well as refraining from terrorism a prerequisite for U.S. funding of all organizations.

For the peace process to be successful, and everyone here sincerely wants this, it is imperative that all of the parties involved expressly understand and recognize the rights of the other parties. Until this happens, true peace, Mr. Chairman, cannot be achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished chairwoman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this very important amendment to the floor. I think it is a critical reminder to the Palestinian Authority that they need to get their act together and that we are losing patience with them. I want to thank the gentleman for a very constructive dialogue earlier today.

Mr. Chairman, I was at the border of Israel and Gaza when the gate fell down. The Israeli people said to the Palestinians, "You can take this. You can have it. Try and build capability here. Try and build a country here. Try and build peace here."

Do you know what they did with it? They sent rockets over the border into Israel. They violated every commitment they made. They didn't develop a capability. They developed Qassam rockets.

Israel is surrounded by threat in the north with Lebanon, where Hezbollah violated the border, kidnapped Israeli soldiers, rained rockets on the north; in Gaza, which has imploded; has an existential threat from Iran, which is our threat as well. In between all those places, you have people running around with grenades strapped around their bodies blowing up themselves and everybody else they can take with them.

Israel has tried to negotiate and negotiate and negotiate, and every time it has negotiated, the result has been an interlocutor that has said, we can't really keep our promises nor can we keep the peace.

So the gentleman's amendment is very, very important, and I want to pledge to work with the distinguished chairwoman, who has had these concerns and who has led this Congress in these concerns for as long as she has been in Congress, with Mr. WOLF, the ranking member, who has led the fight on these concerns, and with the gentleman, so that the Palestinian Authority gets the message that we are losing patience and we will not continue to sit by and allow them to pursue a policy of destructiveness.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman who offered the amendment. I appreciate your offer to withdraw the amendment. I pledge to continue to

work with you and Mr. ISRAEL and the other members of the committee and the Congress. We thank you very much for your intent and your willingness to withdraw.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, is it too much to ask, after nearly 60 years, that Israel's neighbors recognize its basic right to exist. There is simply no reason for the U.S. to be funding entities that do not recognize Israel, the Middle East's only democracy and our staunch ally.

Mr. Chairman, we can argue about the Palestinian Authority and whether we should fund that corrupt and ineffectual government. But there should be no debate when talking about terrorist organizations whose singular purpose is to wipe Israel off the map.

We must send a clear and firm message to Hamas and Hezbollah: as long as you are committed to Israel's destruction, we will commit ourselves to not aiding your survival. End of story.

I thank the gentleman for his clear sighted amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman and the gentleman, both from New York.

Mr. Chairman, knowing that this amendment is vulnerable to a point of order because it goes beyond appropriating and into the legislative realm, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. BOUSTANY of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts.

An amendment by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

Amendment No. 52 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

An amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

An amendment by Mr. PENCE of Indiana.

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 74, noes 343, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 535]

AYES—74

Ackerman	Fortenberry	Neugebauer
Aderholt	Gillmor	Nunes
Alexander	Gingrey	Pearce
Bachus	Granger	Petri
Baird	Hayes	Price (NC)
Baker	Herger	Radanovich
Bishop (UT)	Hoekstra	Rahall
Boehner	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Boustany	Jackson-Lee	Ruppersberger
Brady (TX)	(TX)	Ryan (WI)
Buchanan	Kilpatrick	Sali
Campbell (CA)	Knollenberg	Schmidt
Cannon	LaHood	Sessions
Carter	Lee	Shadegg
Chabot	Mack	Taylor
Clarke	Marchant	Terry
Davis (KY)	Marshall	Thornberry
Davis, Tom	McCotter	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCrery	Walberg
Diaz-Balart, M.	McDermott	Weller
Dreier	McHenry	Wexler
Ellison	McKeon	Wicker
English (PA)	Meeks (NY)	Wilson (NM)
Everett	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Flake	Miller, Gary	Young (FL)

NOES—343

Abercrombie	Conyers	Hall (NY)
Akin	Cooper	Hall (TX)
Allen	Costa	Hare
Altmire	Courtney	Harman
Andrews	Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)
Arcuri	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Baca	Cuellar	Heller
Bachmann	Culberson	Hensarling
Baldwin	Cummings	Herseth Sandlin
Barrett (SC)	Davis (AL)	Higgins
Barrow	Davis (CA)	Hill
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (IL)	Hinchev
Barton (TX)	Davis, David	Hinojosa
Bean	Davis, Lincoln	Hirono
Becerra	Deal (GA)	Hobson
Berkley	DeFazio	Hodes
Berman	DeGette	Holden
Berry	Delahunt	Holt
Biggart	DeLauro	Honda
Bilbray	Dent	Hooley
Bilirakis	Dicks	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Hulshof
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Inglis (SC)
Blackburn	Donnelly	Inslée
Blumenauer	Doolittle	Israel
Blunt	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Bono	Drake	Jefferson
Boozman	Duncan	Jindal
Boren	Edwards	Johnson (IL)
Boswell	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Boucher	Ellsworth	Johnson, Sam
Boyd (FL)	Emanuel	Jones (NC)
Boyd (KS)	Emerson	Jones (OH)
Brady (PA)	Engel	Jordan
Braley (IA)	Eshoo	Kagen
Brown (SC)	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Brown, Corrine	Faleomavaega	Kaptur
Brown-Waite,	Fallin	Keller
Ginny	Farr	Kennedy
Burgess	Fattah	Kildee
Burton (IN)	Feeney	Kind
Butterfield	Ferguson	King (IA)
Buyer	Filner	King (NY)
Calvert	Forbes	Kingston
Camp (MI)	Fossella	Kirk
Cantor	Fox	Klein (FL)
Capito	Frank (MA)	Kline (MN)
Capps	Franks (AZ)	Kucinich
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Kuhl (NY)
Cardoza	Gallely	Lamborn
Carnahan	Garrett (NJ)	Lampson
Carney	Gerlach	Langevin
Carson	Giffords	Lantos
Castle	Gilchrest	Larsen (WA)
Castor	Gillibrand	Larson (CT)
Chandler	Gohmert	Latham
Christensen	Gonzalez	LaTourette
Clay	Goode	Levin
Cleaver	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Clyburn	Graves	Lewis (GA)
Coble	Green, Al	Lewis (KY)
Cohen	Green, Gene	Linder
Cole (OK)	Grijalva	Lipinski
Conaway	Gutierrez	LoBiondo

Loeb sack	Pence
Lofgren, Zoe	Perlmutter
Lowey	Peterson (MN)
Lucas	Peterson (PA)
Lungren, Daniel	Pickering
E.	Pitts
Lynch	Platts
Mahoney (FL)	Poe
Manzullo	Pomeroy
Markley	Porter
Matheson	Price (GA)
Matsui	Pryce (OH)
McCarthy (CA)	Putnam
McCarthy (NY)	Ramstad
McCauley (TX)	Regula
McCollum (MN)	Rehberg
McHugh	Reichert
McIntyre	Renzi
McMorris	Reyes
Rodgers	Reynolds
McNerney	Rodriguez
McNulty	Rogers (AL)
Meek (FL)	Rogers (KY)
Melancon	Rohrabacher
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen
Michaud	Roskam
Miller (MI)	Ross
Miller (NC)	Rothman
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard
Mitchell	Royce
Mollohan	Rush
Moore (KS)	Ryan (OH)
Moore (WI)	Salazar
Moran (KS)	Sánchez, Linda
Moran (VA)	T.
Murphy (CT)	Sarbanes
Murphy, Patrick	Saxton
Murphy, Tim	Schakowsky
Murtha	Schiff
Musgrave	Schwartz
Myrick	Scott (GA)
Nadler	Scott (VA)
Neal (MA)	Sensenbrenner
Norton	Serrano
Oberstar	Sestak
Obey	Shays
Oliver	Shea-Porter
Pallone	Sherman
Pascarell	Shimkus
Pastor	Shuler
Paul	Shuster
Payne	Simpson

Bonner	Gordon	Napolitano
Bordallo	Hastert	Ortiz
Costello	Hunter	Rangel
Cramer	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Loretta
Cubin	Maloney (NY)	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	McGovern	Weiner
Fortuño	Meehan	

NOT VOTING—20

□ 2347

Messrs. REHBERG, KLINE of Minnesota, BILIRAKIS, CULBERSON, MCHUGH, DELAHUNT, BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BACHMANN and Mrs. DRAKE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WILSON of South Carolina, MCDERMOTT, ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, MCKEON, MEEKS of New York, EVERETT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Ms. LEE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 214, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

AYES—203

Ackerman	Green, Al	Nadler
Allen	Green, Gene	Neal (MA)
Altmire	Grijalva	Norton
Andrews	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Arcuri	Hall (NY)	Obey
Baca	Hare	Oliver
Baird	Harman	Pallone
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Bean	Higgins	Pastor
Becerra	Hill	Paul
Berkley	Hinchev	Payne
Berman	Hinojosa	Petri
Berry	Hirono	Platts
Biggart	Hodes	Pomeroy
Bishop (NY)	Holden	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Holt	Rahall
Boswell	Honda	Ramstad
Boucher	Hooley	Rothman
Boyda (KS)	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Hulshof	Rush
Braley (IA)	Inslée	Ryan (OH)
Brown, Corrine	Israel	Salazar
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Camp (MI)	Jackson-Lee	T.
Capps	(TX)	Sarbanes
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Schakowsky
Carnahan	Kagen	Schiff
Carson	Kanjorski	Schwartz
Chabot	Kaptur	Scott (VA)
Chandler	Kennedy	Serrano
Clarke	Kildee	Shays
Clay	Kilpatrick	Shea-Porter
Cleaver	Kind	Sherman
Coble	Kucinich	Shuler
Cohen	LaHood	Sires
Conyers	Langevin	Slaughter
Courtney	Lantos	Smith (NJ)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Solis
Davis (AL)	LaTourette	Stark
Davis (CA)	Lee	Stupak
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sutton
Davis, Lincoln	Lewis (GA)	Tauscher
DeFazio	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	LoBiondo	Thompson (MS)
Delahunt	Loeb sack	Tierney
DeLauro	Lofgren, Zoe	Towns
Dicks	Lowey	Udall (CO)
Doggett	Lynch	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Maloney (NY)	Upton
Doyle	Markey	Van Hollen
Duncan	Matsui	Velázquez
Ehlers	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Ellison	McCollum (MN)	Walsh (NY)
Ellsworth	McDermott	Walz (MN)
Emanuel	McGovern	Wasserman
Engel	McNerney	Schultz
English (PA)	McNulty	
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	
Etheridge	Michaud	
Faleomavaega	Miller, George	
Farr	Mitchell	
Fattah	Mollohan	
Filner	Moore (KS)	
Flake	Moore (WI)	
Frank (MA)	Moran (KS)	
Giffords	Moran (VA)	
Gilchrest	Murphy (CT)	
Gillibrand	Murphy, Tim	

NOES—214

Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Brown (SC)
Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Brown-Waite,
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Ginny
Alexander	Blackburn	Buchanan
Bachmann	Blunt	Burgess
Bachus	Boehner	Burton (IN)
Baker	Bono	Buyer
Barrett (SC)	Boozman	Calvert
Barrow	Boren	Campbell (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	Boustany	Cannon
Barton (TX)	Boyd (FL)	Cantor
Bilbray	Brady (TX)	Capito

Cardoza Johnson (IL) Pryce (OH)
 Carney Johnson, E. B. Putnam
 Carter Johnson, Sam Radanovich
 Castle Jones (NC) Regula
 Castor Jordan Rehberg
 Clyburn Keller Reichert
 Cole (OK) King (IA) Renzi
 Conaway King (NY) Reyes
 Cooper Kingston Reynolds
 Costa Kirk Rodriguez
 Crenshaw Klein (FL) Rogers (AL)
 Cuellar Kline (MN) Rogers (KY)
 Culberson Knollenberg Rogers (MI)
 Davis (KY) Kuhl (NY) Rohrabacher
 Davis, David Lamborn Ros-Lehtinen
 Davis, Tom Lampson Roskam
 Deal (GA) Latham Ross
 Dent Lewis (CA) Royce
 Diaz-Balart, L. Lewis (KY) Ruppersberger
 Diaz-Balart, M. Linder Ryan (WI)
 Dingell Lucas Sali
 Doolittle Lungren, Daniel Saxton
 Drake E. Schmidt
 Dreier Mack Sensenbrenner
 Edwards Mahoney (FL) Sessions
 Emerson Manzullo Sestak
 Everett Marchant Shadegg
 Fallin Marshall Shimkus
 Feeney Matheson Shuster
 Ferguson McCarthy (CA) Simpson
 Forbes McCaul (TX) Skelton
 Fortenberry McCotter Smith (NE)
 Fossella McCrery Smith (TX)
 Foxx McHenry Snyder
 Franks (AZ) McHugh Souder
 Frelinghuysen McIntyre Space
 Gallegly McKeon Spratt
 Garrett (NJ) McMorris Stearns
 Gerlach Rodgers Tancredo
 Gillmor Meek (FL) Tanner
 Gingrey Mica Taylor
 Gohmert Miller (FL) Terry
 Gonzalez Miller (MI) Thornberry
 Goode Miller (NC) Tiahrt
 Goodlatte Miller, Gary Tiberi
 Gordon Murphy, Patrick Turner
 Granger Murtha Walberg
 Graves Musgrave Walden (OR)
 Hall (TX) Myrick Wamp
 Hastings (WA) Neugebauer Weldon (FL)
 Hayes Nunes Weller
 Heller Pearce Westmoreland
 Hensarling Pence Whitfield
 Herger Perlmutter Wicker
 Herseht Sandlin Peterson (MN) Wilson (NM)
 Hobson Peterson (PA) Wilson (SC)
 Hoekstra Pickering Wolf
 Inglis (SC) Pitts Young (AK)
 Issa Poe Young (FL)
 Jefferson Porter
 Jindal Price (GA)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Christensen

NOT VOTING—19

Bonner Hastert Rangel
 Bordallo Hunter Sanchez, Loretta
 Costello Johnson (GA) Scott (GA)
 Cramer Meehan Sullivan
 Cubin Melancon Weiner
 Davis, Jo Ann Napolitano
 Fortuño Ortiz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 2352

Mr. CARDOZA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. MICHAUD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded the remaining votes in this series will be 2-minute votes, and are advised to remain in the Chamber for the execution of their votes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO
 The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 152, noes 268, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

AYES—152

Aderholt Garrett (NJ) Nunes
 Akin Gillmor Paul
 Bachmann Gingrey Pearce
 Bachus Gohmert Pence
 Barrett (SC) Goode Peterson (PA)
 Bartlett (MD) Goodlatte Petri
 Barton (TX) Granger Pickering
 Biggert Graves Pitts
 Bilbray Hall (TX) Poe
 Bilirakis Hastings (WA) Price (GA)
 Bishop (UT) Hayes Putnam
 Blackburn Heller Radanovich
 Blunt Hensarling Rahall
 Boehner Herger Rehberg
 Bono Hobson Renzi
 Boozman Hoekstra Reynolds
 Brady (TX) Hulshof Rogers (AL)
 Brown (SC) Inglis (SC) Rogers (KY)
 Brown-Waite, Issa Rogers (MI)
 Ginny Jindal Rohrabacher
 Buchanan Johnson, Sam Ros-Lehtinen
 Burgess Jones (NC) Roskam
 Burton (IN) Jordan Royce
 Buyer Keller Ryan (WI)
 Camp (MI) King (IA) Sali
 Campbell (CA) Kingston Schmidt
 Cannon Kline (MN) Sensenbrenner
 Cantor Lamborn Sessions
 Carter Lewis (KY) Shadegg
 Chabot Linder Shimkus
 Coble Lucas Shuster
 Conaway Lungren, Daniel Simpson
 Culberson E. Mack
 Davis (KY) Davis, David Manzullo
 Deal (GA) Deal (GA) Marchant
 DeFazio McCauly (CA) McCotter
 Diaz-Balart, L. McCaul (TX) McHenry
 Diaz-Balart, M. McCotter McKeon
 Drake McHenry Morris
 Dreier McKeon Rodgers
 Duncan McMorris
 English (PA) Everett
 Everett Fallin Miller (FL)
 Feeney Miller (MI) Miller (FL)
 Flake Miller, Gary Miller (KS)
 Forbes Moran (KS) Murphy, Tim
 Fossella Foxx Musgrave
 Franks (AZ) Myrick
 Gallegly Neugebauer

NOES—268

Abercrombie Berman Calvert
 Ackerman Berry Capito
 Alexander Bishop (GA) Capps
 Allen Bishop (NY) Capuano
 Altmire Blumenauer Cardoza
 Andrews Boren Carnahan
 Arcuri Boswell Carney
 Baca Boucher Carson
 Baird Boustany Castle
 Baker Boyd (FL) Castor
 Baldwin Boyda (KS) Chandler
 Barrow Brady (PA) Christensen
 Bean Braley (IA) Clarke
 Becerra Brown, Corrine Clay
 Berkley Butterfield Cleaver

Clyburn Johnson, E. B. Porter
 Cohen Jones (OH) Price (NC)
 Cole (OK) Kagen Pryce (OH)
 Conyers Kanjorski Ramstad
 Cooper Kaptur Regula
 Costa Kennedy Reichert
 Courtney Kildee Reyes
 Crenshaw Kilpatrick Rodriguez
 Crowley Kind Ross
 Cuellar King (NY) Rothman
 Cummings Kirk Roybal-Allard
 Davis (AL) Klein (FL) Ruppersberger
 Davis (CA) Knollenberg Rush
 Davis (IL) Kucinich Ryan (OH)
 Davis, Lincoln Kuhl (NY) Salazar
 Davis, Tom LaHood Sanchez, Linda
 DeGette Lampson T.
 Delahunt Langevin Sarbanes
 DeLauro Lantos Saxton
 Dent Larsen (WA) Schakowsky
 Dicks Larson (CT) Schiff
 Dingell Latham Schwartz
 Doggett LaTourette Scott (GA)
 Donnelly Lee Scott (VA)
 Doolittle Levin Serrano
 Doyle Lewis (CA) Sestak
 Edwards Lewis (GA) Shays
 Ehlers Lipinski Shea-Porter
 Ellison LoBiondo Sherman
 Ellsworth Loebsock Shuler
 Emanuel Lofgren, Zoe Sires
 Emerson Lowey Skelton
 Engel Lynch
 Eshoo Mahoney (FL) Slaughter
 Etheridge Maloney (NY) Smith (NJ)
 Faleomavaega Markey Smith (WA)
 Farr Marshall Snyder
 Fattah Matheson Solis
 Ferguson Matsui Souder
 Filner McCarthy (NY) Space
 Fortenberry McCollum (MN) Spratt
 Frank (MA) McCrery Stark
 Frelinghuysen McDermott Stupak
 Gerlach McGovern Sutton
 Giffords McHugh Tanner
 Gilchrest McIntyre Tauscher
 Gillibrand McNerney Thompson (CA)
 Gonzalez McNulty Thompson (MS)
 Gordon Meek (FL) Tierney
 Green, Al Meeks (NY) Towns
 Green, Gene Melancon Udall (CO)
 Grijalva Michaud Udall (NM)
 Gutierrez Miller (NC) Van Hollen
 Hall (NY) Miller, George Velázquez
 Hare Mitchell Visclosky
 Harman Mollohan Walsh (NY)
 Hastings (FL) Moore (KS) Walz (MN)
 Herseht Sandlin Moore (WI) Wasserman
 Higgins Moran (VA) Schultz
 Hill Murphy (CT) Waters
 Hinchey Murphy, Patrick Watson
 Hinojosa Murtha Watt
 Hirono Nadler Waxman
 Hodes Neal (MA) Welch (VT)
 Holden Norton Weller
 Holt Oberstar Wexler
 Honda Obey Whitfield
 Hooley Oliver Wilson (NM)
 Hoyer Pallone Wilson (OH)
 Inslee Pascrell Wolf
 Israel Pastor Woolsey
 Jackson (IL) Payne Wu
 Jackson-Lee Perlmutter Wynne
 (TX) Peterson (MN)
 Jefferson Platts Yarmuth
 Johnson (IL) Pomeroy Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—17

Bonner Fortuño Ortiz
 Bordallo Hastert Rangel
 Costello Hunter Sanchez, Loretta
 Cramer Johnson (GA) Sullivan
 Cubin Meehan Weiner
 Davis, Jo Ann Napolitano

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 2356

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 252, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

AYES—168

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Nunes
Alexander	Gallely	Paul
Altmire	Garrett (NJ)	Pearce
Bachmann	Gerlach	Pence
Bachus	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Baker	Gingrey	Petri
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Pickering
Bartlett (MD)	Goode	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Platts
Bean	Granger	Poe
Biggert	Graves	Price (GA)
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Putnam
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Rahall
Blackburn	Heller	Ramstad
Blunt	Hensarling	Rehberg
Boehner	Herger	Renzi
Bono	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Boozman	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Jindal	Rohrabacher
Ginny	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Burgess	Jordan	Royce
Burton (IN)	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	King (IA)	Sali
Calvert	Kingston	Schmidt
Camp (MI)	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Campbell (CA)	Lamborn	Sessions
Cannon	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Cantor	Linder	Shimkus
Capito	Lucas	Shuler
Carter	Lungren, Daniel	Shuster
Castle	E.	Simpson
Chabot	Mack	Smith (NE)
Coble	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Cole (OK)	Marchant	Stearns
Conaway	Matheson	Tancred
Culberson	McCarthy (CA)	Taylor
Davis (KY)	McCaul (TX)	Terry
Davis, David	McCotter	Thornberry
Deal (GA)	McCrery	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	McHenry	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, M.	McKeon	Turner
Drake	McMorris	Upton
Dreier	Rodgers	Walberg
Duncan	Mica	Walden (OR)
English (PA)	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Everett	Miller (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Fallin	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Feeney	Mitchell	Whitfield
Flake	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Forbes	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (NM)
Fossella	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Myrick	Young (FL)

NOES—252

Abercrombie	Barrow	Boren
Ackerman	Becerra	Boswell
Allen	Berkley	Boucher
Andrews	Berman	Boustany
Arcuri	Berry	Boyd (FL)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Boyd (KS)
Baird	Bishop (NY)	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Braley (IA)

Brown, Corrine	Holden	Pallone
Butterfield	Holt	Pascarell
Capps	Honda	Pastor
Capuano	Hooley	Payne
Cardoza	Hoyer	Perlmuter
Carnahan	Inslee	Peterson (MN)
Carney	Israel	Pomeroy
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Porter
Castor	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Chandler	(TX)	Pryce (OH)
Christensen	Jefferson	Regula
Clarke	Johnson (IL)	Reichert
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes
Cleaver	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Clyburn	Kagen	Ross
Cohen	Kanjorski	Rothman
Conyers	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kildee	Rush
Courtney	Kilpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Crenshaw	Kind	Salazar
Crowley	King (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Cuellar	Kirk	T.
Cummings	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes
Davis (AL)	Knollenberg	Saxton
Davis (CA)	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Kuhl (NY)	Schiff
Davis, Lincoln	LaHood	Schwartz
Davis, Tom	Lampson	Scott (GA)
DeFazio	Langevin	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lantos	Serrano
Delahunt	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Shays
Dent	Latham	Shea-Porter
Dicks	LaTourette	Sherman
Dingell	Lee	Sires
Doggett	Levin	Skelton
Donnelly	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter
Doolittle	Lewis (GA)	Smith (NJ)
Doyle	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Edwards	LoBiondo	Snyder
Ehlers	Loebuck	Solis
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Souder
Ellsworth	Lowey	Space
Emanuel	Lynch	Spratt
Emerson	Mahoney (FL)	Stark
Engel	Maloney (NY)	Stupak
Eshoo	Markley	Sutton
Etheridge	Marshall	Tanner
Faleomavaega	Matsui	Tauscher
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Fattah	McCollum (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Ferguson	McDermott	Tierney
Finer	McGovern	Towns
Fortenberry	McHugh	Udall (CO)
Frank (MA)	McIntyre	Udall (NM)
Giffords	McNerney	Van Hollen
Gilchrest	McNulty	Velázquez
Gillibrand	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)	Walsh (NY)
Gordon	Melancon	Walz (MN)
Green, Al	Michaud	Wasserman
Green, Gene	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Grijalva	Miller, George	Waters
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Watson
Hall (NY)	Moore (KS)	Watt
Hare	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Harman	Moran (VA)	Welch (VT)
Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Weller
Herseht Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick	Wexler
Higgins	Murtha	Wilson (OH)
Hill	Nadler	Wolf
Hinchey	Neal (MA)	Woolsey
Hinojosa	Norton	Wu
Hirono	Oberstar	Wynn
Hobson	Obey	Yarmuth
Hodes	Oliver	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—17

Bonner	Fortuño	Ortiz
Bordallo	Hastert	Rangel
Castello	Hunter	Sanchez, Loretta
Cramer	Johnson (GA)	Sullivan
Cubin	Meehan	Weiner
Davis, Jo Ann	Napolitano	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0001

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 241, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]

AYES—179

Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Myrick
Akin	Gallely	Neugebauer
Alexander	Garrett (NJ)	Nunes
Altmire	Gerlach	Paul
Bachmann	Gillmor	Pearce
Bachus	Gingrey	Pence
Baker	Gohmert	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Petri
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Pickering
Barton (TX)	Granger	Pitts
Bean	Graves	Platts
Biggert	Hall (TX)	Poe
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Bilirakis	Hayes	Putnam
Bishop (UT)	Heller	Radanovich
Blackburn	Hensarling	Rahall
Blunt	Herger	Ramstad
Boehner	Hill	Rehberg
Bono	Hoekstra	Renzi
Boozman	Hulshof	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Jones (NC)	Roskam
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Royce
Buyer	Kagen	Sali
Calvert	Keller	Schmidt
Camp (MI)	King (IA)	Kingston
Campbell (CA)	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Cantor	Kuhl (NY)	Shadegg
Capito	LaHood	Shimkus
Carter	Lamborn	Shuler
Castle	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Chabot	Linder	Simpson
Coble	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Cole (OK)	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Conaway	E.	Stearns
Culberson	Mack	Tancred
Davis (KY)	Manzullo	Tanner
Davis, David	Marchant	Taylor
Deal (GA)	Matheson	Terry
Dent	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCaul (TX)	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCotter	Tiberi
Donnelly	McCrery	Turner
Drake	McHenry	Upton
Dreier	McHugh	Walberg
Duncan	McKeon	Walden (OR)
Ellsworth	McMorris	Wamp
English (PA)	Rodgers	Weldon (FL)
Everett	Mica	Weller
Fallin	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Feeney	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Flake	Miller, Gary	Wicker
Forbes	Mitchell	Wilson (NM)
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Murphy, Tim	Young (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Musgrave	

NOES—241

Abercrombie	Baird	Bishop (GA)
Ackerman	Baldwin	Bishop (NY)
Allen	Barrow	Blumenauer
Andrews	Becerra	Boren
Arcuri	Berkley	Boswell
Baca	Berry	Boucher

Boustany
Boy (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herse
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono

Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone

Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Trotter
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—17

Berman
Bonner
Bordallo
Costello
Cramer
Cubin

Davis, Jo Ann
Fortuño
Hastert
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
Napolitano

Ortiz
Rangel
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Weiner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 0005

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a re-

corded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 390, noes 30, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

AYES—390

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers

Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herse
Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hooley
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack

Maloney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Muggrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence

Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster

Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tancred
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—30

Baird
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson
Christensen
Clay
Cleave
Dingell
Ellison

Gilchrest
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
LaHood

Lee
McDermott
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Rahall
Slaughter
Stark
Waters
Watt
Welch (VT)

NOT VOTING—17

Bonner
Bordallo
Costello
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann

Fortuño
Hastert
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
Napolitano
Ortiz

Pickering
Rangel
Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Weiner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in the vote.

□ 0009

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were

postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 337, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

AYES—84

Bachmann	Foxx	Mica
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave
Bilbray	Gingrey	Neugebauer
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Nunes
Blackburn	Goode	Pearce
Boehner	Granger	Pence
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Ginny	Hayes	Radanovich
Burgess	Jindal	Reichert
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Buyer	Jordan	Sali
Campbell (CA)	Keller	Schmidt
Cannon	King (IA)	Sessions
Cantor	Kingston	Shadegg
Chabot	Kirk	Shuster
Coble	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Cole (OK)	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Latham	Souder
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Davis, David	Lucas	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	Mack	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Turner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Walberg
Drake	McCaull (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McCotter	Westmoreland
Fallin	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Feeney	McMorris	Young (AK)
Forbes	Rodgers	

NOES—337

Abercrombie	Capps	Ehlers
Ackerman	Capuano	Ellison
Aderholt	Cardoza	Ellsworth
Akin	Carnahan	Emanuel
Alexander	Carney	Emerson
Allen	Carson	Engel
Altmire	Carter	English (PA)
Andrews	Castle	Eshoo
Arcuri	Castor	Etheridge
Baca	Chandler	Faleomavaega
Baird	Christensen	Farr
Baker	Clarke	Fattah
Baldwin	Clay	Ferguson
Barrow	Cleaver	Filner
Bartlett (MD)	Clyburn	Flake
Barton (TX)	Cohen	Fortenberry
Bean	Conaway	Fossella
Becerra	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Berkley	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Berman	Costa	Gallegly
Berry	Costello	Gerlach
Biggart	Courtney	Giffords
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Gilchrest
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Gillibrand
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Gillmor
Blumenauer	Cummings	Gonzalez
Blunt	Davis (AL)	Goodlatte
Bono	Davis (CA)	Gordon
Boozman	Davis (IL)	Green, Al
Boren	Davis, Lincoln	Green, Gene
Boswell	Davis, Tom	Grijalva
Boucher	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Boustany	DeGette	Hall (NY)
Boyd (FL)	Delahunt	Hall (TX)
Boyd (KS)	DeLauro	Hare
Brady (PA)	Dent	Harman
Brady (TX)	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Brown (SC)	Doggett	Heller
Brown, Corrine	Donnelly	Hensarling
Buchanan	Downs	Herger
Butterfield	Doyle	Herseth Sandlin
Calvert	Dreier	Higgins
Camp (MI)	Duncan	Hill
Capito	Edwards	Hinchey

Hinojosa	McKeon	Sánchez, Linda
Hirono	McNerney	T.
Hobson	McNulty	Sarbanes
Hodes	Meehan	Saxton
Hoekstra	Meek (FL)	Schakowsky
Holden	Meeks (NY)	Schiff
Holt	Melancon	Schwartz
Honda	Michaud	Scott (GA)
Hooey	Miller (MI)	Scott (VA)
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Hulshof	Miller, Gary	Serrano
Inglis (SC)	Miller, George	Sestak
Inslee	Mitchell	Shays
Israel	Mollohan	Shea-Porter
Issa	Moore (KS)	Sherman
Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)	Shimkus
Jackson-Lee	Moran (KS)	Shuler
(TX)	Moran (VA)	Simpson
Jefferson	Murphy (CT)	Sires
Johnson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick	Skelton
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy, Tim	Slaughter
Jones (NC)	Murtha	Smith (NJ)
Jones (OH)	Myrick	Smith (WA)
Kagen	Nadler	Snyder
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Solis
Kaptur	Norton	Space
Kennedy	Oberstar	Spratt
Kildee	Obey	Stark
Kilpatrick	Oliver	Stupak
Kind	Pallone	Sutton
King (NY)	Pascarell	Tanner
Klein (FL)	Pastor	Tauscher
Kline (MN)	Paul	Taylor
Knollenberg	Payne	Terry
Kucinich	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Kuhl (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Lampson	Petri	Thornberry
Langevin	Pickering	Tiberi
Lantos	Pitts	Tierney
Larsen (WA)	Platts	Towns
Larson (CT)	Poe	Udall (CO)
LaTourette	Pomeroy	Udall (NM)
Lee	Porter	Upton
Levin	Price (GA)	Van Hollen
Lewis (CA)	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Visclosky
Linder	Putnam	Walden (OR)
Lipinski	Rahall	Walsh (NY)
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Walz (MN)
Loeb sack	Regula	Wamp
Lofgren, Zoe	Rehberg	Wasserman
Lowe	Renzi	Schultz
Lungren, Daniel	Reyes	Waters
E.	Reynolds	Watson
Lynch	Rodriguez	Watt
Mahoney (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Waxman
Maloney (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Welch (VT)
Markey	Rohrabacher	Weller
Marshall	Roskam	Wexler
Matheson	Ross	Whitfield
Matsui	Rothman	Wicker
McCarthy (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (NM)
McCarthy (NY)	Royce	Wilson (OH)
McCollum (MN)	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McCrery	Rush	Woolsey
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Wu
McGovern	Ryan (WI)	Wynn
McHugh	Salazar	Yarmuth
McIntyre		Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bonner	Hastert	Ros-Lehtinen
Bordallo	Hunter	Sanchez, Loretta
Cramer	Johnson (GA)	Sullivan
Cubin	Napolitano	Weiner
Davis, Jo Ann	Ortiz	
Fortuño	Rangel	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 0013

Mr. HERGER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last three lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as “The Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2008”.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate the Appropriations Committee for putting together a bipartisan bill that provides assistance for such important issues as global health, humanitarian assistance in Sudan, the environment and peacekeeping operations around the world.

The 2008 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill reinforces the notion that foreign policy is about more than the use of military force and that foreign assistance and humanitarian aid are important components of foreign policy making.

The bill provides \$949 million for Sudan, of which \$210 million is for critical humanitarian and peacekeeping programs in Darfur. The remaining funds are for development assistance and to strengthen democratic institutions in southern Sudan.

Global health efforts also receive funding in this bill. The bill provides \$5 billion for HIV/AIDS treatment, prevention and care programs around the world.

The bill also includes \$501 million for clean energy and biodiversity programs worldwide. Educational and cultural exchanges receive more than \$500 million to fund participation of over 42,000 individuals in educational, cultural, and professional exchange programs including Fulbright exchanges.

The bill also contains funding for programs in many countries around the world, including Pakistan.

The U.S. appreciates Pakistan's effort in the fight against global terrorism. However, President Musharraf's decision to enter into a non-aggression pact with tribal leaders in the Waziristan region appears to have provided a safe haven for the Taliban and has led to an increase in Taliban and al Qaeda attacks inside Afghanistan. We should encourage the Pakistani Government to reconsider this policy.

As we provide additional support to Pakistan, we must also make it clear that we stand with those calling for free and fair elections. The firing of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Muhammad Chaudhury raises serious questions about President Musharraf's commitment to an independent judiciary and the rule of law. The U.S. must make clear to the people of Pakistan that we support the democratic process and expect President Musharraf to honor his pledge to abandon his dual role as both head of state and head of the armed forces.

The United States has long stood as a beacon for human rights, democracy, and the rule of law. That beacon has been dimmed as a result of the Bush administration's blunders and abuses in places like Iraq and Guantanamo Bay. These practices have created a perception that the United States has a double standard when it comes to the rule of law and the promotion of democracy. We must speak with a clear and consistent voice on these issues or we will continue to lose our credibility, erode our ability to influence decisions, and weaken our national security.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Year 2008 State-Foreign Operations Appropriations bill and also to congratulate Chairwoman LOWEY for her impressive job in crafting a spending bill that meets our important commitments to the international community.

I would especially like to thank Chairwoman LOWEY and the State-Foreign Operations Subcommittee for including language in the Committee Report that I requested regarding the science and technology literacy and capacity in the U.S. Department of State. Additionally, the Committee Report includes language I requested supporting the variety of science fellowship programs in the Department of State, including the science-diplomacy fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), the professional society fellows, and the recently established Jefferson Science Fellows Program.

The Office of the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary of State (STAS) has played an important role at the Department of State since 2000. As the chief scientist at State, the Adviser has brought greater visibility to "science for diplomacy" and "diplomacy for science." STAS has increased the number of PhD scientists and engineers employed at the Department, including AAAS fellows, professional society fellows, and most recently, Jefferson Science Fellows program.

I am glad that the Committee Report includes language applauding the work of the STAS for continuing to promote the essential role of science and technology in diplomacy. More importantly, the committee strongly encourages the Department to continue to increase science and technology capacity and literacy within the Department and the role of science and technology in our Nation's foreign policy. And the committee requests that the Secretary of State be prepared to report during hearings on the Fiscal Year 2009 request on progress made during the 2008 fiscal year. I look forward to working with the State Department and the Appropriations Committee to ensure that advances are made to achieve these stated goals during this upcoming fiscal year.

Second, language included in the Committee Report supports the JSF and the other science fellowship programs in the Department of State and makes clear that the committee believes they are valuable programs that should be expanded in the years ahead.

As a former AAAS science fellow I know first hand about the important role that science fellows serve in helping policymakers better understand and are able to advance science and technology as a major component of diplomacy.

One such program, the Jefferson Science Fellows (JSF) program was established Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in 2003. By providing 1-year fellowships to tenured academic scientists and engineers from our Nation's colleges and universities, the JSF program works to incorporate the American science, technology, and engineering communities into the formulation and implementation of U.S. foreign policy. Each Jefferson Science Fellow is hosted during their fellowship at the Department of State or a foreign embassy abroad. Jefferson Science Fellows are now contributing their scientific expertise to such challenging problems as nuclear non-proliferation, assessments of nanotechnology, pandemics like avian flu, and extreme weather. As the JSF program matures, this growing cadre of practicing experts with first-hand knowledge of the workings within the Department of State will be an increasingly important resource throughout the government.

Again, I would like to thank the committee for including this language and I look forward

to working with the committee as we build the role of science in our Nation's diplomacy.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fiscal 2008 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Act and to express my appreciation for the significant increase in funding for trade capacity building.

This bill raises the Federal appropriation to \$214 million, \$87 million more than the administration requested.

Regardless of one's position on trade, helping our trading partners, particularly those in developing countries, with the financial assistance to improve enforcement of their labor and environmental laws is a good thing.

I would encourage the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee to consider holding a hearing to assess how these funds have been effective at building capacity in these developing countries.

I think there is a good story that should be told.

Looking forward, however, we have several free trade agreements that we will be asked to consider in the next few months, Peru, Panama, Colombia, and Korea.

Three, Peru, Panama and Colombia, are with developing countries that are eligible to receive trade capacity assistance.

And while none of these agreements is a done deal, Colombia appears to be the one with the greatest level of concern.

A number of our colleagues are rightly concerned about Colombia's record on human rights and the alarmingly high number of labor leaders that have been killed in recent years.

Given this concern, I would like to see this appropriation clarify that some portion of the \$214 million should go specifically to the Colombian Government, the attorney general's office, which is charged with investigating these killings and bringing the perpetrators to justice.

The attorney general has no easy task.

President Uribe's effort to disband the paramilitary groups and bring about a peace agreement with the insurgents has made progress, but it has also overwhelmed the attorney general's office and the courts with a backlog of petitions to adjudicate.

Thousands of cases of former paramilitary soldiers and insurgents must be investigated before any seeking amnesty can be pardoned.

Only those proven innocent of any human rights abuses are granted amnesty.

I understand that the killing of labor leaders is being investigated, but the progress is slow and complicated by competing demands to clear the backlog of requests for pardons and amnesties.

I think Colombia would welcome our financial assistance to expedite the investigations into human rights abuses and killings of labor leaders.

I also think an offer of assistance would be a tangible demonstration of our willingness to help them address our concerns.

I encourage you to consider this request when you begin your discussions with the Senate on a final conference agreement.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly object to the reduction in assistance to Colombia and the significant redirection of funding for counternarcotic programs in this legislation.

Now is not the time to turn our backs on one of our most important democratic allies in the Western Hemisphere. We need to reaffirm,

not dismantle, our commitment to these programs, to the people of Colombia, and to American citizens.

The drug trade in Colombia is a major factor in the instability in Latin America; it is killing Americans every day, and is a source of funding for terrorism in the hemisphere.

I have traveled to Colombia several times over the past few years and can say firsthand our significant investment is beginning to pay dividends. Under the leadership of President Uribe, Colombia has experienced success in fighting narcoterrorism and bringing democratic stability to the country.

Now is not the time to cut funding—when progress is being made.

We must recognize the difficult work of President Uribe and the challenges he faces with guerillas, paramilitary groups, drug traffickers, and terrorists.

Despite these difficulties, Uribe has rescued his country from a near-failed-state status and has reestablished state presence in areas of the country that for decades lacked it. Drug traffickers are being captured and extradited to the U.S. for prosecution, kidnapping rates have decreased significantly, and the Colombian people finally feel safe traveling within their own country.

We are also seeing tremendous results in illegal crop eradication, and Plan Colombia's efforts have produced record reductions in coca cultivation and in the destruction of drug labs. Each week brings news of new seizures of cocaine and heroin—interdictions that are usually the result of U.S. supplied intelligence.

Of course obstacles remain, and progress may be slower than my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like it to be.

But now is not the time to turn our backs on this battle which is so intrinsically tied to our war on terrorism and the scourge of illegal drug use. The Uribe administration is committed to this war but it needs U.S. assistance to improve mobility, intelligence, and training.

Congress must continue to provide sustained funding for Plan Colombia and Andean Counterdrug Initiative programs and approve a free trade agreement.

The administration requested \$589 million for promoting development and fighting drugs in Colombia.

Full funding of programs coupled with a free trade agreement is critical to sustaining our success in Colombia, fostering development and investment, and protecting our interests in Latin America.

It's simple, Mr. Chairman, we cannot win this war on drugs and drug-supported terrorism without the proper tools and resources.

Colombia is a key ally in an increasingly anti-American region—we must do everything we can to ensure it remains a political and economic partner.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2764, the State-Foreign Operations Appropriations for FY 2008 and to commend Chairwoman LOWEY for her exceptional leadership in shepherding this bill through the legislative process.

I strongly support this legislation because it is an indispensable measure in restoring America's international prestige and leadership position in the global community. Equally important, this legislation reflects what is good about America: its generosity, its concern for the less fortunate, its commitment to protecting the weak and uplifting the downtrodden, and the recognition that we live in an

interdependent world. You will recall the wise counsel of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who said, "we will either live together as brothers or we will perish as fools."

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 2764 because it rests upon a solid foundation supported by four pillars or guiding principles: (1) the United States must respond to humanitarian suffering and health crises; (2) the United States should set an example for the world in providing development assistance because development efforts play a crucial role in increasing global stability; (3) the United States must continue to make addressing global HIV/AIDS a key priority; and (4) the United States must increase its efforts to support its allies in the global war on terror. This legislation accomplishes all of these goals and does so in a fiscally responsible manner. In fact, the \$34.2 billion dollars appropriated in H.R. 2764 is substantially less—\$700 million less—than the amount requested by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, as founder and co-chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus I am constantly reminded of the importance of programs to enhance the health of women and children the world over. In fact, the best way to improve the life chances of poor children living in the poorest countries is to elevate the quality of maternal health of their mothers.

In Sub-Saharan African countries, 1 out of every 14 girls entering adolescence will die before the end of her childbearing years. More than 11 million children will die before reaching their fifth birthday from preventable causes like pneumonia, diarrhea, measles, malaria, and malnutrition. That translates to about 30,000 children deaths a day. It is unconscionable to lose these lives when they can be saved with low-cost interventions.

Mr. Chairman, during my last visit to the United Nations I was proud to attend the United Nations Special Session on Children, where I pledged my commitment to improving the lives of children over the next decade. H.R. 2764 takes a big step toward fulfilling this commitment.

The bill provides \$1.9 billion for the Child Survival and Health Programs Fund, intended to reduce infant mortality and to improve the health and nutrition of children, especially in the poorest nations. This is an increase of 25 percent over the administration's short-sighted request. In addition the bill allocates \$750 million in grants to organizations that support basic education programs, \$300 million for safe water programs, and \$501 million for environment and clean energy programs.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps nowhere on earth is America's commitment to its fundamental values more on trial than in the crucible of human misery and suffering that is Darfur in Sudan. Since 2003, we have witnessed a systematic campaign of displacement, starvation, rape, mass murder, and terror in the Sudanese region of Darfur. In the years since the conflict began, we have commemorated the 10th anniversary of the 1994 Rwandan genocide and the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, but promises of "never again" ring empty as genocide is allowed to continue in Sudan. As violence persists despite peace treaties and African Union peacekeeping efforts, now is the time to follow admirable rhetoric with definitive action to stop the violence in Darfur.

The Government of Sudan, through both support of the Janjaweed militia and direct

military action, is responsible for systematic assaults against civilians belonging to the Fur, Zaghawa, and Masalit ethnic groups. In the past 4 years, the genocide in Darfur has claimed more than 450,000 lives and has displaced well over 2 million civilians. While some of these have made their way to overcrowded refugee camps in neighboring Chad, most remain trapped within Sudan. These displaced persons are completely dependent on international aid for their survival, the arrival and distribution of which has been impeded by the Sudanese Government.

It has been nearly a year since the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1706, authorizing the deployment of 20,000 U.N. peacekeepers to bolster the 7,000-strong African Union force already active in the area. It has now been over a year since I traveled to Chad and walked across the border to Sudan. I had the opportunity to meet with these African Union troops, who pleaded for expanded peacekeeping authority and the resources to protect the refugees from violence.

In addition to the ongoing suffering of civilians within Sudan, the violence has now spilled across the borders into both Chad and the Central African Republic, and is undermining any prospects for stability in the entire region. Relations between Chad and Sudan have rapidly deteriorated, and, in addition to the flood of refugees moving across the border, the two nations have become locked in a proxy war. Chadian rebel groups, based in Darfur and supported by the Sudanese Government, have been launching cross-border attacks on civilians in Chad since late 2005. Similarly, fighting between rebels and government troops has displaced over 70,000 people in the northeastern region of the Central African Republic. The situation in these neighboring nations has deteriorated to the point where the United Nations is working towards the deployment of a peacekeeping force to these two countries.

In short, the humanitarian crisis in the Darfur region of Sudan also continues. International observers, including the Bush administration, have determined what is taking place in Darfur is genocide. As we demonstrated in Kosovo, once roused to act in the face of evil, America will be resolute and triumphant. That is why I am so pleased that H.R. 2764 provides \$210.5 million for critical humanitarian and peacekeeping programs in Darfur, which is 90 percent above the President's request.

The bill also provides an additional \$738.8 million, \$4 million above the President's request, for Sudan, primarily for development assistance to build the economic base and strengthen democratic institutions in southern Sudan. The bill prohibits any funds for the Sudanese Government unless the Secretary of State certifies that Sudan has ended all support for Arab militias attacking black Muslims in Darfur and unless Sudan allows unimpeded access for humanitarian assistance.

Likewise I welcome the \$1.3 billion in funding provided in the bill for U.N. peacekeeping missions. These funds will support peacekeeping operations throughout the world. The bill also provides \$293 million, which is 31 percent above FY 2007 and 33 percent above the President's request, for targeted peacekeeping operations, missions that are of particular interest to the United States. This total includes an additional \$100 million, not requested by the President, to provide critical support to the African Union Peacekeepers in Darfur.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to HIV/AIDS, we are talking about a tragedy of epic proportions, domestically and internationally. In my home State of Texas 3,298 new AIDS cases were reported in 2006, fourth highest in the country. Texas also claims the fourth largest population living with AIDS, nearly 30,000 people or 14.7 per 100,000. Of these new cases in Texas, nearly 42 percent involved African Americans. HIV/AIDS is an issue that affects all of us, according to the U.N., 2.9 million people died of AIDS in 2006; further there are now 39.5 million people living with HIV around the world.

The \$5.1 billion provided in H.R. 2764 for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, care programs, TB and Malaria assistance programs is desperately needed to resolve human suffering. It is also 33 percent above FY 2007 and 13 percent more than the President requested.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, I know how important it is for the United States to be engaged in the quest for peace in the Middle East. That is why I am pleased that the bill provides \$2.4 billion in assistance for Israel, our strong ally, and the only flourishing democracy in that region.

Another key ally, Egypt, warrants our continued assistance. H.R. 2764 provides \$1.3 billion for military grants and \$415 million in economic assistance. However, the bill withholds \$200 million of the military grants until the Secretary of State certifies that Egypt is taking steps to address human rights concerns by reforming its judiciary and training its police, as well as addressing concerns about smuggling of weapons from Egypt to Gaza. Since Egypt has proven itself over the years to be a reliable friend and partner in the search for peace, I am confident that the Secretary of State will soon be able to make their required certification.

While there will be those who have the view that the war in Afghanistan is over and we should shift our view, the truth is that Afghanistan is as vital to our Nation now as it was shortly after September 11. Operation Enduring Freedom was a success in removing the Taliban leadership and giving the Afghan people new hope; however our work there is far from done. We must ensure that Afghanistan has a bright and productive future ahead of itself, in which peace and prosperity will be possible. The bill provides \$1.1 billion in humanitarian, reconstruction and related assistance to Afghanistan—including \$235 million in counternarcotics funding and \$75 million for programs specifically related to helping women. The measure withholds all but \$225 million of the economic support funds until the Secretary of State certifies that the national and local governments in Afghanistan are fully cooperating with U.S.-funded narcotics eradication and interdiction efforts.

Although there is legitimate concern about what appears to be the Pakistani Government's disappointing progress in the area of democratic governance and the rule of law, we must remember Pakistan has proven to be a strong ally during both the cold war and the current global war on terror. Pakistan's strategically important location and the firm support of President Musharraf have played a major role in toppling the Taliban regime and preventing it from regaining power in Afghanistan. Pakistan is an important part of our national

security and critical to regional stability. The bill provides \$350 million for general economic assistance and \$300 million in foreign military financing for Pakistan.

Additionally, through various cooperative efforts between the United States and Pakistan, there has been a marked improvement in such fields as economic trade and investment, health care, democracy human rights, education, and science and technology.

Colombia is a vital partner and ally of the United States. Recognizing the strategic importance of Colombia as I do, I strongly support the \$530.6 million provided for drug interdiction and eradication efforts in Colombia, coupled with economic development assistance for drug-affected communities in Latin America.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me speak approvingly about the bill's funding of key State Department operations. H.R. 2764 fully funds the President's request of \$1.8 billion for ongoing security upgrades to ensure that our embassies remain safe and secure for the tens of thousands of military and civilian staff serving in roughly 260 posts worldwide. Additionally, the bill provides \$501 million, which is 11 percent above FY 2007 and 3 percent above the President's request, to fund the participation of over 42,000 individuals in educational, cultural and professional exchange programs worldwide. I know the value of these exchange programs. In fact, last year I attended the 6th Annual Doha Forum in Qatar as an invited panelist at a special symposium focusing on this very subject.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2764 because it is an indispensable measure in restoring America's international prestige and leadership position in the global community. I thank Chairwoman LOWEY on her fine work in bringing this exceptional legislation to the House floor where it should receive an overwhelmingly favorable vote.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to two destructive amendments to the State-Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2008.

First, I oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS.

This amendment will strike an essential provision in this bill for preventing the spread of HIV and AIDS around the world. Mr. PITTS' amendment would strike a provision included in the bill which give the President greater flexibility and the ability for U.S. funded HIV/AIDS programs to better respond to the epidemics in each country.

This does not have to be a pro-choice or pro-life debate. In fact, it is short-sighted for us to think of it that way. This debate should be about prevention. It should be about providing necessary tools for proper prevention including providing contraception, ensuring access to condoms and providing educational information to those in need.

We have the ability to reduce the number of cases of HIV/AIDS around the world by allowing for greater flexibility in how we implement prevention funding. Instead of taking an approach where we require that one-third of all HIV/AIDS prevention funds be spent on abstinence only programs, that are not only ineffective in preventing sexual activity, but in fact harmful to the health and well being of young women, we should be allowing for greater flexibility in how we allocate these essential funds.

The statistics on the number of cases of HIV around the world are startling. In 2006, there were 4.2 million new HIV infections. According to UNAIDS, women and girls make up half of all HIV infections worldwide. And according to the World Health Organization, unprotected heterosexual sex is the leading cause of HIV infections around the world and 80 percent of new infections in sub-Saharan Africa.

Clearly, calls for abstinence alone are not working. We must admit to ourselves that young people, whether by choice or through coercion, are engaging in sexual activity. We have the tools to prevent less unintended pregnancies. We need to use them efficiently and effectively.

In order for any HIV/AIDS prevention program to be successful, we must make sure that we use proper prevention tools like condoms and contraception. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Pitts amendment.

Further, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH and my colleague from Michigan, Mr. STUPAK.

Access to contraceptives and condoms is essential to stop the number of cases of HIV/AIDS around the world. With good reasons, the Subcommittee under the leadership of Ms. LOWEY from New York has included a provision that will allow foreign organizations that are currently prohibited from receiving family planning assistance under the global gag rule to receive in kind contributions of condoms and contraceptives.

I believe that the global "gag rule" is onerous and should be lifted because it not only bans foreign non-governmental organizations, NGOs, from using their own funds to engage in free speech and assembly activities on a woman's right to choose, but it also prevents health care providers from counseling the world's poorest women about all their legal health care options.

But the provisions in this bill do not lift the global gag rule. What these provisions do is promote proper family planning information and services. As a basic prevention form of healthcare, family planning services can improve maternal and child health in developing countries, lead to better diagnosis and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases, and reduce the incidence of unintended pregnancy and abortion. The global gag rule has stopped U.S.-donated contraceptives from reaching 16 countries with people in desperate need in Africa, Asia and the Middle East. Simply allowing access to contraceptives is a small and necessary step in prevention.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. POMEROY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2764) making appro-

priations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 498, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 178, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

YEAS—241

Abercrombie	Dent	Kagen
Ackerman	Dicks	Kanjorski
Allen	Dingell	Kaptur
Altmire	Doggett	Kennedy
Andrews	Donnelly	Kildee
Arcuri	Doyle	Kilpatrick
Baca	Edwards	Kind
Baird	Ehlers	King (NY)
Baldwin	Ellison	Kirk
Barrow	Ellsworth	Klein (FL)
Bean	Emanuel	Lampson
Becerra	Engel	Langevin
Berkley	English (PA)	Lantos
Berman	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Biggert	Etheridge	Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Farr	LaTourette
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Lee
Blumenauer	Ferguson	Levin
Bono	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Boswell	Fossella	Lipinski
Boucher	Frank (MA)	LoBiondo
Boyd (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Loebuck
Boyda (KS)	Gerlach	Lofgren, Zoe
Brady (PA)	Giffords	Lowe
Braley (IA)	Gilchrest	Lynch
Brown, Corrine	Gillibrand	Mack
Butterfield	Gonzalez	Mahoney (FL)
Capps	Gordon	Maloney (NY)
Capuano	Green, Al	Markey
Cardoza	Green, Gene	Matheson
Carnahan	Grijalva	Matsui
Carney	Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)
Carson	Hall (NY)	McCollum (MN)
Castle	Hare	McDermott
Castor	Harman	McGovern
Chandler	Hastings (FL)	McHugh
Clarke	Herseth Sandlin	McNerney
Clay	Higgins	McNulty
Cleaver	Hill	Meehan
Clyburn	Hinchey	Meek (FL)
Cohen	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Conyers	Hirono	Melancon
Cooper	Hobson	Michaud
Costa	Hodes	Miller (NC)
Costello	Holden	Miller, George
Courtney	Holt	Mitchell
Crowley	Honda	Moore (KS)
Cuellar	Hooley	Moore (WI)
Cummings	Hoyer	Moran (VA)
Davis (AL)	Inslee	Murphy (CT)
Davis (CA)	Israel	Murphy, Patrick
Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Murtha
Davis, Tom	Jackson-Lee	Nadler
DeFazio	(TX)	Neal (MA)
DeGette	Jefferson	Oberstar
Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Oliver

Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes

Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—178

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Berry
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)

NOT VOTING—13

Bonner
Cramer
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Hastert

Hunter
Johnson (GA)
Napolitano
Ortiz
Rangel

Paul
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Tancredo
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Sanchez, Loretta
Sullivan
Weiner

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 7:30 p.m.

Ms. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 8:00 p.m.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today from 2:30 p.m. until 4:30 p.m.

Mr. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a long-standing family commitment.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and tomorrow on account of traveling to Alabama with the President of the United States and the First Lady.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOYER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 20, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 57. To repeal certain sections of the Act of May 26, 1936, pertaining to the Virgin Islands.

H.R. 692. To amend title 4, United States Code, to authorize the Governor of a State, territory, or possession of the United States to order that the National flag be flown at half-staff in that State, territory, or possession in the event of the death of a member of the Armed Forces from that State, territory, or possession who dies while serving on active duty.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Friday, June 22, 2007, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2277. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Maryland Regulatory Program [MD-055-FOR] received June 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2278. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Reporting Requirements and Conservation Measures [Docket No. 061127309-7100-02; I.D. 110706D] (RIN: 0648-AU72) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2279. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Interim Rule Extension [Docket No. 061213334-6334-01; I.D. 120806B] (RIN: 0648-AV05) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2280. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Closure of the 2007 Deep-Water Grouper Commercial Fishery [Docket No. 040205043-4043-01] (RIN: 0648-XA46) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2281. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 506 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003—Limitation on Charges for Services Furnished by Medicare Participating Inpatient Hospitals to Individuals Eligible for Care Purchased by Indian Health Programs [CMS-2206-F] (RIN: 0917-AA02) received June 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2282. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement [USCBP-2007-0057; CBP Dec. 07-28] (RIN: 1505-AB48) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2283. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Industry Director Directive #1 on Backdated Stock Options [LMSB Control No. 04-0407-036 Impacted IRM 4.51.5] received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 2313. A bill to establish research, development, demonstration, and commercial application programs for marine renewable energy technologies; with an amendment (Rept. 110-202). Referred to the

□ 0031

So the bill was passed.